An intertextual perspective on the semantics of *hypotassō* in the deutero-Pauline and catholic letters

Joel Stephen Brown

Thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Theology in the Faculty of New Testament

at Stellenbosch University

Supervisor: Peter Nagel

March 2021

DECLARATION

By submitting this thesis electronically, I declare that the entirety of the work contained therein is my own, original work, that I am the sole author thereof (save to the extent explicitly otherwise stated), that reproduction and publication thereof by Stellenbosch University will not infringe any third party rights and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it for obtaining any qualification.

25 February 2021

Abstract

The Koiné Greek verb hypotassō (ὑποτάσσω) is a rare term in ancient literature. Traditionally the term is rendered as “submit” or “subject” and features prominently in the “household codes” and parenetic of the deutero-Pauline and Catholic epistles. These so-called “submission” texts are used to justify and legitimize abusive behaviour—and even though literary and inscriptional evidence suggest this rendering is inaccurate, there seems to be resistance to responsibly adopting new terminology.

This study asks two pertinent questions: (a) what did hypotassō signify for a first-century recipient of these epistles, and (b) is “submission” or “subject” the most faithful translations of the term. This study is a search for both designative (denotation) and associative (connotation) meaning, and includes a close, literary analysis of each usage of hypotassō found within the deutero-Pauline and Catholic epistles. This is followed by a comparative, semantic analysis of documents that attest to intertextual connections based on a shared conceptual thought-world.

In the deutero-Pauline epistles, hypotassō is closely associated with “unity”, “brotherly love” and “partnership”. In the Catholic epistles the term is associated with “honour”, “humility”, and the “sovereignty of God”. Plutarch uses hypotassō to describe mutuality and cooperation in marriage, and Xenophon of cooperation in leadership. Wisdom literature reveals the term’s associations with shepherds, humility, and divinely authorized rule. In the Aesop Romance (Vita G), the term is used of kings creating hegemony, and how their subjects subvert it. In the end, the modern denotations and connotations of “submission” are shown to lack the complexity, nuance, and implicative flexibility of hypotassō—while “submission” is acquiescence to authority, hypotassō creates identity in navigating it. As a term of household and nation, hypotassō needs to be understood through the interpretative lens of the collectivistic, honour-shame cultures of the 1st century. In the nexus of community, honour, and the sovereignty of the divine, hypotassō finds its truest expressions in mutual obligation, not subjugation; respect, not compliance; and unity, contra chaos.

Ultimately, hypotassō was not used to “put people in their place”, but to “create identity and connection” in a cultural quagmire. It is my hope that this research helps scholars reimagine and reinterpret the “submission” texts, so these texts can be translated with more fidelity and taught with more humility.

Abstrak

Die Koiné Griekse werkwoord hypotassō (ὑποτάσσω) is ’n skaars term in antieke literatuur. Tradisioneel word die term met "onderwerp" of "onderdanig wees" vertaal, en word hoofsaaklik in die "huishoudelike kodes" en parenetiese gedeeltes van die deutoro-Pauliniese en Katolieke briewe gebruik. Hierdie sogenaamde "onderdandig wees" tekste word gebruik om gedrag wat spreek van mishandeling te regverdig en te legitimeer. En alhoewel die literêre en inskripsionele bewyse suggireer dat sodanige betekenis nie akkuraat is nie, word daar weerstand gebied om nuwe terminologie te oorweeg in die vertaling en interpretasie van tekste.

Hierdie studie vra twee pertinente vrae: (a) wat hypotassō moontlik vir n eerste-eeuse leser sou kon beteken, en (b) is "onderwerping" of "onderdanig wees" getroue vertalings van die term. Die studie is ’n ondersoek na beide ‘n toegeskryfde (aanduidend) en geassosieerde (konnotasie) betekenis van hypotassō, en sluit ’n in-diepte lees en literêre analise van elk van die gebruike van hypotassō in die deutero-Pauliniese en Katolieke briewe in. Dit word gevolg deur ’n vergelykende, semantiese analise van dokumente wat getuig van intertekstuele konneksies wat gebasseer is op ’n gemeenskaplike konseptuele denkwêreld.

In die deutero-Pauliniese briewe, word hypotassō geassosieer met "eenheid", "broederlike liefde" en "venootskap". In die Katolieke briewe word die term geassosieer met "eer", "nederigheid", en die "soewereiniteit van God". Plutarch gebruik hypotassō om gemeenskaplikheid en samewerking in ’n huwelik te beskryf; en Xenophon om samewerkende leierskap te omskryf. Wysheidsliteratuur wys weer op die term se assosiasie met herders, nederigheid, en goddelike gesanksioneerde heerskappy. Die term in Aesop Romanse (Vita G) word gebruik vir konings wat hegenomie skep, en hoe hulle onderdane dit ondermyn. Op die ou einde wys moderne aanduidende en konnotatiewe betekenisse van "onderwerping" op ’n gebrek aan die komplekse, genuanseerde, en impliserende buigsame karakter van hypotassō, terwyl "onderwerping" toegewy word aan gesag en hypotassō aan die skep van identiteit en die navigasie daarvan. As ’n term van huishouding en nasie, behoort hypotassō verstaan te word deur die interpratiewe lens van die kollektiewe, eer-en-skaamte kultuur van die eerste-eeu. In die nexus van gemeenskap wees, eer, en die soewereiniteit van die goddelike, vind hypotassō sy volle uitdrukking in gemeenskaplike verpligting, nie onderwerping; respek, nie slaafse nakoming nie; en eenheid teenoor chaos.

Die uiteinde is dat hypotassō nie gebruik is om "mense in hulle plek te plaas nie", maar om "identiteit en konneksies te skep" in ’n kulturele moeras. Dit is my hoop dat hierdie studie navorsers sal help deurdat die "onderwerping" tekste die verbeelding opnuut weer sal aangryp en die tekse geherinterpreteer sal word, sodat die vertalings meer getrou sal wees, en die onderigting daarvan met nederigheid sal geskied.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

Submission is a hot button topic in the world today, and understanding submission is a central part of the debates raging about gender equality, leadership, family values, and governance (Westfall 2016:313). Christians living in this world are not only affected by these discussions but play an active role in them—often relying on Biblical teaching as the foundation for their point of view. Westfall, speaking of the Pauline corpus in the New Testament (NT), contends that "within the tradition of interpretation, the passages [concerning] gender have not been understood in the contexts of the discourses in which they occur" (2016:3); and accuses traditional interpretation, through misunderstanding of textual and cultural context, of creating "a theology of power and control that privileges one group over another" (2016:3). The issues of who is authorized to teach, preach, or lead in church communities is compounded with complex and varied cultural understandings of the roles of males and females in marriage and society—evidenced in the on-going, ideological, evangelical polemics between egalitarianism and complementarianism[1].

Should quiet obedience be the primary expression of submission? It is presented as such in several prominent lexicons used by the modern church to develop its teachings (BDAG, LN). Zamfir found that Biblical, prophetic metaphor and the so-called "household codes" of the NT epistles have been used—for centuries until now—to justify the marginalization and violent abuse of Muslim and Christian women in Eastern Europe (2018:8-10). Zamfir, while noting the works of Mouton, Donelson, Bauman-Martin in "rescuing" these problematic texts, reiterates Schüssler Fiorenza's noteworthy stance, that,

> *"Household codes spiritualise the call to submission and demand the acceptance of an oppressive social order as a religious duty, reinforcing the structures of domination" (Schüssler Fiorenza in Zamfir 2018:8).*

These household codes, and other NT texts, do ostensibly command submission to God, wifely submission to husband, children to father, and slave to master. There are even imperatives for Christians to submit to earthly governments; imperatives used to justify and legitimize racism, slavery, apartheid, corporal punishment, and Nazism (Hoekema 1986:919).

[1] CBE International (https://cbeinternational.org) should be referenced for egalitarianism; and The Council of Biblical Manhood and Womanhood for complementarianism (https://cbmw.org).

These “household codes” are found amongst the texts Westfall has categorized as misunderstood, misconstrued, misapplied, and needing of reinterpretation. When one looks at these texts, the Koiné Greek word translated to English as “submission” is the term hypotassō (ὑποτάσσω). If we look closely at the culture of the author who originally selected that term, will we find that our understanding is aligned to his? Is “submission” the best translation? Furthermore, what did submission mean then as compared to what it means now? As shown above, the experience of submission is not widely regarded as beneficial, uplifting, or harmonious. Submission seems to be demanded from people in power, and the Biblical text used to subjugate. Do we understand submission through a lens influenced more by injury than inquiry?

1.1 Background and Primary Sources

In *As Christ Submits to the Church*, Padgett presents a dual-definition of submission, delineated as type I and II, with the former focused on external obedience to greater power, and the latter on the voluntary, internal abdication of one’s will (2011:38-39). Padgett’s work is one of the more expansive on the topic of a modern, evangelical Christian understanding of submission in Ephesians and 1 Peter—two epistles containing household codes and the highest density of reference to hypotassō. However, this study is less a topical study on submission, and more a semantic investigation of hypotassō.

Having been challenged in my “traditionalistic” evangelical beliefs after reading Westfall’s *Paul and Gender: Reclaiming the Apostle’s Vision for Men and Women in Christ*, and as my wife took a position directing a women’s empowerment programme across southern, eastern, and central Africa, I was confronted with the necessity of developing my own, genuine, ideology and theology of gender, family, and society. Professionally, I work as a teacher and exegetical consultant for a Bible translation agency, and have the opportunity, and great blessing, of being able to work with indigenous, mother-tongue translation projects across the continent. I decided to engage in a completely informal study and survey of Christianized, African views on marriage—and far-and-away, the most common answer to the question, “what does the Bible say about husbands and wives?” is a response akin to, “God says wives must submit to their husbands”. Now, I don’t say this to disparage the translators I work with—not at all—this experience, though, challenged me personally to investigate. Not only if “God” really “says” that; but also, why is this the dominant marital message being taught in the spread of western Christianity. This, and other similar experiences, added to my growing dissatisfaction with my own culture’s abandonment of

marriage (Preato 2009), the gender-based violence of (South) Africa, and my own inherited, "complementarian" beliefs. All of this to say, I eventually wrote a mini-thesis on 1 Timothy 2:11 (yes, the "women shouldn't exercise authority" passage) in my honours programme, and was introduced to the world of rare Greek terms and hapax legomena, and their histories fraught with potential for misinterpretation and miscommunication. I decided to carry on my research into these supposed "submission" texts and household codes; and found that many uses of hypotassō are indeed in a construct called a "household code" and these codes are exclusive to the deutero-Pauline and catholic letters. As such, it seemed an investigation of the culture, associative semantics, form and setting, and history of the term might be helpful.

For understanding ancient perspectives on hypotassō, I will be engaging a variety of lexicons and critical commentaries. I will primarily refer to *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, 3rd ed. (BDAG)* for Greek interpretation—this is a well-respected lexicon with rich history of European and North American contribution, and the 3rd edition includes over 15,000 new citations as compared to the 2nd. As a companion text—one that compliments the dictionary presentation of BDAG by organizing terms into semantic categories and with more descriptive senses (definitions)—I will be referencing Louw and Nida's *Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains, 2nd ed.* For commentaries—and I apologetically note that due to COVID-19 lockdowns, I was more limited than I would like—I will primarily be referencing two series. First is the Word Biblical Commentary series (WBC). In this series "commentators were asked to prepare their own rendering of the original biblical text and to use those languages as the basis of their own comments and exegesis " (Hubbard 1987:x)—so while the commentary is admittedly evangelical in nature, much of the commentary includes a discussion on why they render terminology as they do, and in doing so they engage a broad range of other academic scholarship. Secondly, I will be using the *New International Commentary (NICNT & NICOT)*, as this series integrates a wide range of academic and religious material.

Finally, the methodology, semantic terminology, and general perspective on the principles and theory of translation lying behind this research are found in Nida and Louw's *Lexical Semantics of the Greek New Testament.* I studied semantics and discourse analysis using this material as a part of my consultancy training with the Bible translation agency, The Word for the World. This seminal work on semantics provides a critical and complex perspective on evaluating meaning and is pivotal in my exploration of hypotassō.

1.2 Problem, Methodology, and Hypothesis

In the deutero-Pauline and catholic letters, the term *ὑποτάσσω* (*hypotassō*) is traditionally translated into English as *submit* or *subject*—terms with potential to cause strong, negative, emotional reactions in modern readers. Critically, Nyland asserts that, hypotassō

> *"[was] a rare word. Prior to the papyri, insufficient examples existed outside the New Testament for lexicographers to grasp its meaning, therefore careful 'guesses' were made" (Nyland 2003:5).*

However, despite this papyrological evidence, English translations of the NT continue to render hypotassō as *submission* and *subjection* (see Appendix 1). It has been established that these texts have been used to justify violence and abuse, and if there is any chance that, as Westfall posits, these texts have been misunderstood or mistranslated, then it is worth investigating how and why. This raises two important questions:

1) What did *hypotassō* signify to the author and original recipients of these texts?
2) Is "submission" the most faithful translation of the term?[2]

In order to evaluate the meaning and use of hypotassō, I will be implementing Nida and Louw's methodology for the scientific, semantic analysis of lexemes which recognizes,

> *"there are two quite distinct types of meaning: designative, which represents referents, and associative, which involves supplementary features relating to the lexemes" (Nida & Louw 1992:7-8).*

Evaluating associative meaning is notoriously difficult, but it is a necessary part of understanding a word, especially when the word is often rendered by an interpretation with significant, and possibly divergent, associative meaning on its own (e.g. submit). As such, I will endeavor to evaluate both designative and associate meaning, and each of these types of meaning will require different treatment.

This study will be conducted as literary research useful in the field of Biblical theology (as defined by Goldsworthy 2000:45-46) and will be focused around a close exegesis of the term hypotassō in the cultural and rhetorical contexts found in the deutero-Pauline and catholic letters. This research will be expanded to include an intertextual perspective on how the two corpuses relate to each other, the LXX, and other textually and contextually related, 1st-century literature. This is an effort to tease out a more close-to-original

[2] Bible translators discuss "fidelity" in translation, noting "it is not that particular lexical-grammatical structure that is to be carried over into the receptor language, but rather the message/meaning carried by it in the original" (Hess 1989. Notes on Translation 3.3:1–30).

understanding, rather than the hermeneutics of later church fathers. This thesis will be a synchronic semantic comparison of various texts created in similar cultural and theological settings.

For treating designative meaning, I will use two primary processes (Nida & Louw 1992):

1) Analyze different uses of the same word within a corpus
    a) List all contexts of hypotassō from a corpus without an English gloss
    b) Classify the contexts according to contrasts in use
    c) Evaluate and refine the semantic features of the term
2) Analyze different words in the same semantic domains within a corpus
    a) Establish a series of semantically related meanings
    b) Establish shared semantic features
    c) Establish contrasts and determine minimal features of contrast
    d) Determine relationships between meanings

In performing these analyses, a set of semantic features will be established which will be a qualitative list of the most likely designations arising from the texts themselves.

Understanding associative meaning requires cultural and community knowledge which may or may not be available. To find and understand the connotations of hypotassō within each corpus, I will be engaging the aforementioned primary sources, as well as dictionaries[3] (LSJ, LALS), grammars (Wallace, Mounce, Volt), theological dictionaries (TDNT), academic books (Elliot, Achtemeier, Bruce, deSilva, Bryant),and academic articles regarding epistolary form, idiomatic language, cultural practice, and early church history (Mouton, Punt, Osiek, Fee, Nyland, MacDonald, Kurke). This evaluation will take the form of theological exegesis, as the meaning of a discourse must necessarily inform the understanding of the words used therein. While this type of exegesis may seem less scientific than the quantitative domain of word lists and semantic matrices, I am compelled to this endeavor by Louw and Nida's words that,

> *Many persons have the impression that associative meanings (or values) are rather ephemeral (subject to rapid change) and highly individualistic. But that is really not the case. Extensive investigations of this phenomenon by C. E. Osgood (1964) and his colleagues have shown that associative meanings are widespread and remarkably stable within any society. In fact,*

[3] Please see "Works Cited" for abbreviations of reference materials.

> *they seem to be every bit as extensive and enduring as designative meanings." (Louw and Nida 1992:34)*

The value of this research is to provide a synchronic, 1st century understanding of hypotassō. If it is true that centuries of cultural misunderstanding have colored our understanding of submission, or that submission is simply not a faithful translation of hypotassō, then we must work to rectify this situation. If we can obtain a closer-to-original understanding of the term, we can better determine the unique contributions of these texts and hopefully provide for a less abusive future. It is my hope to provide analysis that will be useful to translators, exegetes, consultants, and cultural leaders in the developing church in understanding Biblical texts with more fidelity, accuracy, and clarity.

By researching the designative and associative features of hypotassō in the deutero-Pauline and catholic letters, I hope to create a critically clarified understanding of hypotassō. I expect to find enough significant semantic divergence between the ancient use of *hypotassō* and the modern concept of submission to justify a re-evaluation of the modern terminology used in translating the term.

1.3 Introduction to hypotassō

Every exploration begins with a starting point, and this study originates with the lexical definitions for *hypotassō.* The following table lists the senses from various NT lexica for hypotassō:

Lexicon	Definitions for ὑποτάσσω
A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature (BDAG 2000)	to cause to be in a submissive relationship, to subject, to subordinate; to add a document at the end of another document, attach, append, subjoin
New Testament Greek Lexicon – NAS (NAS [2020])	to arrange under, to subordinate; to subject, put in subjection; to subject one's self, obey; to submit to one's control; to yield to one's admonition or advice; to obey, be subject A Greek military term meaning "to arrange [troop divisions] in a military fashion under the command of a leader". In non-military use, it was "a voluntary attitude of giving in, cooperating, assuming responsibility, and carrying a burden".
Lexicon of the New Testament Based on	something under the firm control of someone—'to subject to, to bring under control.'

Semantic Domains (Louw-Nida 1996)[4]	
A Greek-English Lexicon (Liddell-Scott-Jones [2020])	place or arrange under, assign; post in the shelter of; draw up behind; subject; subdue, make subject; to be obedient; underlie, to be implied in or associated with; put after; subjoin, append; govern the subjunctive

The NAS, which incorporates information from Strong's Exhaustive Concordance, describes hypotassō as having an origin in the primary verb tassō (meaning "to put in order"), and the preposition hypo (meaning "by, under") (NAS [2020]). With these initial readings, one can see hints of the word's semantic range, in designation (denotation) and association (connotation), and one can start to see potential metaphoric and idiomatic uses arise from the earliest uses of the word.

When reading the lexical definitions, there seems to be a tension between the idea of "the action of ordering or arranging a relationship" and "the transfer of control of something or the subjection of will". I am suspect this seemingly subtle difference is caused by a modern interpretation of the effect of "placing something under" rather than on the term's use in ancient text. The pragmatic effect of soldiers being assigned to a commander is that the commander has had his potential for destruction increased in pursuing his sovereign's will; put in other words, while the soldiers are certainly expected to follow their commander's orders, one can also conceive that the impact of the "placing" of soldiers is that the commander is now supported by a more powerful force. The term hypotassō denotes the actions of a higher authority in organizing, arranging, and delegating various authority and tasks to both the commanders and the soldiers—in other words, creating a collective whose individual members share an identity. Additionally, the authorized initiative which is the force behind hypotassō is not necessarily transferred to the one "under" whom resources have been placed, but authority stays with the one doing the placing. In 2 Maccabees 8:9, we see these exact implications surrounding the use of hypotassō, "And Ptol′emy promptly appointed Nica′nor the son of Patroc′lus, one of the king's chief friends, and sent him, *in command* of no fewer than twenty thousand Gentiles of all nations, to wipe out the whole race of Judea" (RSVCE). I will analyse various contexts of hypotassō later, for now I simply want to illustrate that if we take the action of "ordering/placing/arranging/attaching" away from the meaning of hypotassō, we might lose the word's semantic thrust.

[4] It should be noted the Louw-Nida puts hypotassō into two different semantic domains: "Control, Rule" and "Obey, Disobey"—a decision based on interpreting the word as synonymous with καταστέλλω (to restrain or quiet) and ὑπείκω (to obey). This is also the only lexicon to exclude other possible senses from the word.

At the same time, I am reminded of Carson's warnings in *Exegetical Fallacies* that a word's etymology can often mislead an interpreter to misunderstand a word used in differing contexts, and that both semantic anachronism and obsolescence need to be carefully considered (1984:26-35). In his introduction for *A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature* (BDAG), Bauer describes the Koiné Greek used by NT authors as having "suffered radical changes" which include the compounding of prepositions with verbs to "put new life into certain forms … [which are] indistinct in meaning" and the appropriation of foreign words (2000). From the textual evidence, we know that the word hypotassō was used in contexts ancient, contemporary, and subsequent to the deutero-Pauline and catholic epistles, and several questions arise. What semantic components of meaning—connotation and implication—arise from the study of the term hypotassō in these letters? What semantic components of meaning arise from the study of the term in the LXX and what Hebrew terms were translated to hypotassō? What are the implied meanings of hypotassō that can be determined from studying the word in critically related, 1st century texts?

While a diachronic analysis of the term is outside the scope of this thesis, I will analyse the term as used in the deutero-Pauline and catholic letters. Was this ancient military term itself assigned to a different battalion?

Chapter 2: Hypotassō in the deutero-Pauline Texts

> *"The traditional interpretations and understandings of the Pauline theology of gender should not be guarded as a citadel and treated as a privileged reading of the texts must be incontrovertibly proved wrong with hard evidence before considering other options." (Westfall 2016:313)*

2.1 Evaluating the deutero-Pauline letters as a corpus

While arguing the authorship of the deutero-Pauline corpus is not in the scope of this study, certainly any endeavour in lexical-semantics should include authorial evaluation. This said, I will be operating from the current academic consensus that this corpus is pseudonymous in nature. This decision is based on the following arguments:

1) An analysis of the term hypotassō made based on Paul's usage in his authentic letters[5] would likely create an *ad verecundiam* argument, and thus overemphasize those results. Put differently, filtering the text through a purely Pauline lens may obscure one's ability to tease out potentially unique or contrasting semantic features.
2) Much of the argument against Pauline authorship is centred around word use, and both the forms and word choice in the deutero-Pauline canon generally seems to place the texts more comfortably in the late 1st century (deSilva 2004:737-738) or early 2nd century. An analysis of the use of the term in this cultural setting may uncover semantics more pertinent to the text's originating milieu.

The decision to evaluate the corpus, however, is not from a disparaging perspective on pseudonymous texts. Quite the contrary, I find Porter's argument for the early collection of a Pauline corpus convincing (2013:106-117). Note, there is not only evidence of late 1st century liturgical and didactic use of both the authentic and disputed letters, but also that the disputed letters were sorted and collected separately within these collections.

Regardless of authorship, evaluating the deutero-Pauline letters as a corpus is a well-established academic and ecumenical tradition, and if it is true that these letters are an early, church attempt at interpreting and applying Pauline teachings to mostly Gentile

[5] See Marielle Frigge (2012) for Catholic summary; David deSilva (2004: §Excursus Pseudepigraphy and the New Testament) for a summary on a common, conservative Evangelical perspective.

communities, then there is value in looking to understand these texts' potentially unique contributions to the early church's developing theology.

2.1.1 The contexts of hypotassō

The following is a list of all the literary contexts using the lemma hypotassō in the deutero-Pauline letters. The forms of hypotassō are left untranslated to help see past preexisting interpretative filters and to highlight syntactic contrasts between the contexts.

Table 2-1

ID	Reference	Koiné Text / Partial Translation
1	Eph 1:22	καὶ πάντα **ὑπέταξεν** ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ and **ὑπέταξεν** all things under his feet
2	Eph 5:21	Ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ Ὑποτασσόμενοι each other in reverence of Christ
3	Eph. 5:24	ἀλλ' ὡς ἡ ἐκκλησία **ὑποτάσσεται** τῷ Χριστῷ but as the church **ὑποτάσσεται** to (the) Christ
4	Col. 3:18	Αἱ γυναῖκες, **ὑποτάσσεσθε** τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ὡς ἀνῆκεν ἐν κυρίῳ and wives, **ὑποτάσσεσθε** to husbands as is fitting in (the) Lord
5	Titus 2:5	**ὑποτασσομένας** τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν **ὑποτασσομένας** to their own husbands
6	Titus 2:9	δούλους ἰδίοις δεσπόταις **ὑποτάσσεσθαι** ἐν πᾶσιν slaves to their own masters **ὑποτάσσεσθαι** in all things
7	Titus 3:1	Ὑπομίμνῃσκε αὐτοὺς ἀρχαῖς ἐξουσίαις **ὑποτάσσεσθαι** Remind them **ὑποτάσσεσθαι** to rulers (and) authorities

2.1.1.1 Starting to classify contexts according to contrasts

First, there are some grammatical and syntactical contrasts to note from these contexts. As a verb, the lemma, *hypotassō*, can take both accusative and dative nouns. Additionally, the lemma appears in the paradigms: indicative aorist active (1), participle present middle (2), indicative present passive (3), imperative present middle (4), participle present passive (5), and infinitive present middle (6, 7). In the seven uses of hypotassō in the deutero-Pauline corpus, only one is in the active voice, and interestingly this use is the only one found in an explicit LXX quotation[6]. This contrast shows us that while hypotassō can be understood actively, the referent action is generally understood as having some reflexive aspects

[6] While not a referenced quotation, Ephesians 1 has several strong allusions to LXX Psalms, and I will later argue that the author is clearly applying LXX ideas to Gentile situations.

(middle voice) or as being done to the subject (passive voice). This emphasizes the need to understand the *doer* of the action as an important semantic feature of the word. The referent action can be applied with imperatival force, which certainly adds some sense of authority implicit in the action; and the participial and infinitive uses of the word show that focus can be put onto the action itself or the doer. These grammatic contrasts help create a framework useful in limiting our generally senses to a minimal set.

Second, this analysis requires a short look at the cases[7] used in these contexts. Wallace, quoting Williams, explains the most common use of a dative substantive with a transitive verb as either: receiving the direct object of an active verb, or the subject of a passive one (2000:67). He also explains that the accusative substantive of a transitive verbs "receives the action of the verb" and that this usage is so common that its interpretation as such should be routine (2000:83). This perspective does help clarify something about the nature of the action involved in hypotassō. There is a dative or prepositional phrase in every context, but not an accusative. In the only active usage, context 1, the subject is performing the action of the verb; but in all the other contexts the subject is being received by the dative with an implied accusative doing the action. Each context 2-7 explicitly states the dative substantive, but not an accusative. In the passive constructions (3, 5), the one doing the action is not specified in immediate context. Also worth noting, in the middle voice contexts (2, 4, 6, 7), the subjects are performing the action or at least complicit in allowing the action to be performed. Since authority and will are integral to understanding hypotassō, the intricacies of exactly what is being done and according to who's will become an integral part of interpretation.

From these uses, a few semantic contrasts become immediately apparent: the referent action can be done to people (2, 4, 5, 6), collections (3, 7), or things (1); the action can involve movement or placement (1); the action can be done directly (1), can be done to something (3, 4, 5), or to oneself (2, 6, 7); something inherent to the action has to do with a set order or rules (5, 6, 7); the action can enact or display reverence, awe, or rightness (2,4); and while the action seems stative in some cases (3, 5, 6) there seems to be an element of will or acquiescence in others, as it can be chosen or reminded (1, 2, 4, 7).

Based upon these contrasts, several semantic categories begin to form:

[7] For this thesis I am utilizing a "five-case" perspective on Koine Grammar (Wallace 2000:25-27).

Table 2-2

ID	Sense
A	Actions taken against something that moves the recipient of the action to a new position, inferring that the subject has the authority or power to perform said action;
B	Actions done to someone which effectually places them into pre-established relationships to people or systems of order;
C	Actions undertaken which obligate oneself to some established relationship with a person or system of order;
D	Acting in or from a position one is placed into within an organizational structure.

Now, we need to glean more details about the referent action so we can classify its uses. Louw-Nida recommends using lexicon glosses only as a tentative indicator of minimal contrasts in order to prevent modern presuppositions from introducing unintended features (1996:42-51). Looking again at the meanings found in four prominent lexicons (§1.3), we see two primary meanings denoting the idea of "causing [one] to be in a submissive relationship" or "to bring [one] under the control of" (BDAG, Louw-Nida) and two focused on "to arrange under" or "assign" (NAS, Liddell-Scott-Jones). All four include "to subject to" as a possible sense. The older lexicons both include a wider semantic range, including: "cooperation", "assuming responsibility", "underlie", "to be associated with", "yielding to advice", and "obey". The newer lexicons are focused on the ideas of "coerced submission", forced or expected "obedience", and "direct control"; these glosses can have strong, negative connotations in modern English and do not seem to allow for the semantic flexibility required by our emerging classifications. As is widely recognized, hypotassō has potential for a wide range of meanings, and if you take a moment to apply some of these glosses to the deutero-Pauline contexts, you will see that the statements can take on vastly different meanings.

2.1.1.2 Excursus: Compound word or hypo + verb

This process of evaluating glosses creates space to explore the root words of hypotassō. The NAS Lexicon identifies hypotassō as originating from the terms *ὑπο* (a preposition) and *τάσσω* (a verb meaning *to place or to put*) ([2020]). Considering the previously stated semantic tension created by Koiné's re-invention of words, the question becomes if hypotassō is more used as a compound word with senses separate from its roots, or if it is

used as a verb with a preposition affixed? The answer, of course, will be found in context, but some semantic features of the preposition and the root verb will be helpful in finding contrasts as we classify the deutero-Pauline contexts of hypotassō.

According to BDAG, when used with the passive of a verb, ὑπό (hypo-) is a marker of agency or cause; this is usually glossed as *by*. Additionally, the word clearly denotes the ideas of authority, superiority/inferiority, and it often acts as a "marker of that which is in a controlling position" (2000). So, while it is true that, when used with an accusative of location, the word can denote the locational idea of "under", the usual sense of the word, especially when used with a verb, is about the agency, power, and/or authority of the one doing the placing, not the direction or destination that results from the action.

Much modern theology around "submission" has developed from this semantic imagery of under and over. Using Grudem as an example, he argues that hypotassō *always* puts the recipient of the actions under the authority of someone else, and that this placement is *never* reversed (2004:465-467). The problem with this understanding is that it ignores the agent of the verbal action. This understanding infers that the recipient's "will" or "authority" is always the thing being "placed", or that the verbal agent's authority is the thing being placed, not the recipient of the verbal action. This semantic requirement is not fully supported in the texts themselves.

Towner, relying heavily on Goppelt, argues that care needs to be taken to *not* indiscriminately infer the idea of "under" when interpreting hypotassō. Not only does the regular use of the middle voice (this regularity is upheld in the deutero-Pauline corpus) suggest a softening of this term, but the accent falls on the root (taxis/tassesthai) not on the prefix (1989:213). When evaluating the construct hypotassō as a preposition + verb, acknowledgement of the agent seems to be an important semantic feature as the preposition tends to indicate agency; the grammar supports emphasis on the action itself (not the result); and, understanding hypo- as a marker of agency aligns very closely with contextual usage. In fact, understanding hypo- as "by" rather than "under" in use with the action of "placing", "ordering", or "putting" provides clarity in understanding rather than furthering semantic ambiguity.

Some scholars reject understanding hypotassō as a preposition + verb with the accusation of etymological fallacy. This view is summarized by Nyland who argues that the papyri reveal a more appropriate semantic range for the word and limits the semantic range to the ideas of "support, append, and uphold" (2003). In a similar, though not so polemic, stance, Kroeger argues that hypotassō, while originating as a military term of hierarchy, developed

associative meanings including: serving as an ally, attaching to, associating with, or even simply to relate in a meaningful way (Kroeger & Nason-Clark 2010:126).

Interestingly, if we look at hypotassō as a compound word, there is a more significant need for understanding agency not less. When looking at the meaning of a verb—especially a transitive one--the agent (the doer), the recipient, the direction, and the result all need to be investigated closely. When looking at the contexts previously listed, the direction of the action is frequently explicit; if the idea of "under" was completely implicit in the term, then there would not be a need to add further prepositional phrases. Additionally, and again, if the semantic focus of hypotassō is about "position" and not "agency" then why is the term often qualified with further datives re-indicating position; and this at a loss of indication or even ignorance of agency?

Looking again at the lexicons, there is clear reference to "authority" in understanding hypotassō, but I find that the term focusses more on the idea that the verbal agent has the authority to be doing the arranging, rather than on a transfer of authority from the agent to the receiver. Put more simply, hypotassō, when evaluated as a compound word or prefixed verb, seems to denote an ordering *done by an authority* which places objects into an existent structure.

2.1.1.3 Classifications for hypotassō

At this point, we need to create the minimal set of classifications required by the semantic features emerging form the contextual contrasts and linguistic features of the word. In comparing the contexts from Table 2-1, it is clear that the referent action can be performed by an agent external to the recipient (1, 3, 5) or reflexively (2, 4, 6, 7); but there is no explicit reason that the nature of the action differs according to the agent. When done "to you" or "to yourself" the results can be similar, in that the result either shows reverence or "fitting-ness" (2, 3), or the reinforcement of pre-established relationships (4, 5, 6, 7), or a new position in relationship to something else (1). In other words, the new or reinforced position in an existent ordered system certainly comes with implications, but those implications are a part of those systems, not necessarily the action of one being put into them. The semantic focus of hypotassō again seems to point at the authority and agency of the one doing the "ordering", not necessarily the authority of those involved in the relationships being (re)defined.

This line of reasoning helps to reduce our classifications even further:

Table 2-3

ID	Sense
A	The act of being placed or positioned into an ordered system by an authorized agent
B	The recognition or maintenance of having been arranged into an ordered system by an authorized agent

These two classifications account for all the contexts in the deutero-Pauline epistles without presuming implicit information. This analyzation reveals the following fundamental semantic features of hypotassō:

a) There is action event happening which places or puts an object somewhere or into some kind of relationship—the event of this attachment is transitive, and one should avoid too perfective of a basic meaning, and also be cognizant of the verbal agent. The event of the verb is explicitly the creation and reception of a bond, the nature of the bond is only implicit, and comes from context.
b) There is an agent performing the action.
c) There is some pre-existing ordered system (I am specifically avoiding the term hierarchy, as even this term presumes much about the underlying system) which qualifies the operation of the arrangement.

2.1.2 The uses of lexemes related to hypotassō

The next step in evaluating hypotassō will be in looking how this word is used in relation to other terms in this corpus to analyze paradigmatic relationships, not just the syntactical. Louw-Nida, in discussing methodology for finding the semantic relationships between similar lexemes, recommends one start by selecting a semantically focused set of meanings and then to identify and compare semantic features found by analyzing: distinctions; crucial minimal and supplementary features; and the various relationships existing between the words (1992:86). Louw-Nida also tell of the difficulty in accomplishing meaningful analyzation as these semantic relationships often involve subtle contrasts and various shades of associative meaning existent in any text's sociological setting (1992:82). While a closer look at each direct context containing hypotassō is to come—and will include further discussion on paradigmatic relationships—we will perform a cursory, paradigmatic analyzation to further develop the core and crucial features of hypotassō, rather than its direct use in a particular context.

Table 2-4

Lemma	Simple Sense
ὑπείκω	Withdraw, give way to, submit
πειθαρχέω	obey
τίθημι	To put, to assign, to bring about an arrangement
ὑποταγή	State of submissiveness, subjection, subordination
βραβεύω	Be judge, decide, control, rule
δογματίζω	To obligate
ἀπείθειαa/ἀπειθής	Disobedience, disbelief / to disobey
αὐθεντέω	To assume a stance of independent authority, give orders to, dictate
παραδίδωμι	Hand over, give over, entrust, commit
κρατέω	Attain, hold, control, size, hold upright, support, hold in place
ἀνυπότακτος	Independent, rebellious disobedient
ἀνακεφαλαιόω	Sum up, recapitulate
τάσσω	To arrange, order, put in place, determine, appoint, fix

I have determined these related terms using the set of meanings emergent from §2.1.1, which can be summarized as: an action whereby an agent puts an object into an ordered system. I also included terms found to be synonyms in Louw and Nida's *GLNTSD* (1996).

2.1.2.1 Distinctions arising from rebellion, lawlessness, and disposition

The verb hypotassō does not appear in either of the epistles to Timothy—preventing direct paradigmatic analyzation—but there is a discussion resembling household codes; qualifications for church leadership; and discussion regarding one's relationship to the law. In these discussions are examples of attitudes and actions taken against systems of organization, and the positions in these structures are usually described by nouns which are often derivatives of hypotassō (including hypotagē).

Table 2-5

ID	Reference	Koiné Text / Partial Translation
A	1 Tim 1:9	ὅτι δικαίῳ νόμος οὐ κεῖται, ἀνόμοις δὲ καὶ **ἀνυποτάκτοις** for law is not does not exist for [the] righteous, but for the lawless and **rebellious**
B	1 Tim. 3:4	τέκνα ἔχοντα ἐν **ὑποταγῇ** keeping his children **submissive**

C	Titus 1:6	μὴ ἐν κατηγορίᾳ ἀσωτίας ἢ **ἀνυπότακτα** not accused of debauchery or **insubordination**
E	Titus 1:10	Εἰσὶν γὰρ πολλοὶ [καὶ] **ἀνυπότακτοι** for they are many and insubordinate

The author of 1 Timothy, identified as Paul, differentiates good teaching and bad; making a statement of fact that the law is not for the righteous but for a list of evildoers (A); this list of persons in positions or states described as *not righteous* starts with "ἀνόμοις δὲ καὶ ἀνυποτάκτοις"—the lawless and rebellious. In this context, ἀνυποτάκτοις, a derivative of hypotassō, carries the semantic features of "refusing submission to an authority" (BDAG [2020]). In this context (A), there is an apparent distinction between *anamos*: acting against the law; and *anypotaktos*: acting against the authority that put you under the law. This reveals implications that both breaking the law and disrespecting its authority are ontologically opposed to righteousness within the ordered system of law.

Anyptaktos is used elsewhere in the deutero-Pauline epistles, and the use of negative nouns and adjectives to describe one's position or attitudes within a structured system are common, and well-established within both early church and Hellenic literature (Marshall & Towner 2004:148-150). In comparing these codes, the noun forms of hypotassō are used in reference to: disobedient and independent wasteful dissipation (C); a respectful and obedient disposition towards a father who is exemplifying honorable dignity (B)[8]; and, undisciplined or rebellious men who disrupt families for shameful, personal gains (E).

Analyzing the semantic relationships within these contexts reveals that hypotassō can refer to:

a) An accepting or respectful attitude or disposition towards the ordered structure or system into which one is placed
b) Can bring honour (or shame) to the one who has responsibility or authority over an ordered system.

These semantic relationships reinforce the idea that understanding the agency within and authority over an ordered system is a crucial part of understanding hypotassō, and furthermore, one's attitude towards the system is a matter of honor and respect.

[8] Marshall & Towner (2004) argue for understanding submissiveness as being something deeper than obedience or conformity; rather, in NT community contexts, there is an attitude towards apostolic faith and "marks of the faith" which should be displayed by children which bring honor to their father as they have learned those virtues from him.

2.1.2.2 Difference between being given and being appointed

The following table lists the deutero-Pauline contexts which contain the words *tithēmi* and *paradidōmi*. These two terms are used in similar contexts to hypotassō and refer to actions that affect an individual's purpose or governing authority.

Table 2-6

ID	Reference	Koiné Text / Partial Translation
A	1 Tim 1:12	**θέμενος** εἰς διακονίαν **appointing** [me] into service
B	1 Tim. 1:20	οὓς **παρέδωκα** τῷ Σατανᾷ whom I **handed over** to Satan
C	1 Tim. 2:7	εἰς ὃ **ἐτέθην** ἐγὼ κῆρυξ into this I was **appointed** [as] a preacher
D	2 Tim. 1:11	εἰς ὃ **ἐτέθην** ἐγὼ κῆρυξ into this I **was appointed** [as] a preacher
E	Eph. 4:19	ἑαυτοὺς **παρέδωκαν** τῇ ἀσελγείᾳ they **gave** themselves over to self-abandonment
F	Eph. 5:2	καὶ **παρέδωκεν** ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν and **gave** himself up for us
G	Eph. 5:25	καὶ ἑαυτὸν **παρέδωκεν** ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς and **gave** himself up for her

Since the verb form of hypotassō is not used in 1 & 2 Timothy, there are no direct paradigmatic relationships to analyze, however, the authorized action which is undertaken to move a person is tithēmi—a semantically flexible word usually glossed as put, appoint, assign, establish, or deposit (BDAG [2020])—and in these contexts (A, C, D) refers to "apostolic appointment in terms of divine initiation and necessity" (Marshall & Towner 2004:389). In verbal usage, tithēmi seems to put focus on the role or job to which one is assigned. While the absence of the verb form of hypotassō cannot be used as conclusive comparison, its usage in noun forms focusses on one's disposition towards a structure and how that attitude honors or dishonors authority.

Louw and Nida describe paradidōmi as handing something over to someone "particularly a right or authority" (GLNTSD [2020]), and both BDAG and GLNTSD discuss the term in a legal context, specifically regarding the idea of a person being "handed over" to an enemy authority. Interestingly, only in context B (the only Timothy-an context) is there an idea of

someone handing over someone else; in contexts E, F, G (all in Ephesians) the word is always used of oneself. Additionally, contexts F, G are both used in direct proximity with hypotassō (Table 2-1:id 2,3). Ephesians 5 will be discussed in more depth below, but for now, I am mentioning a crucial distinction between the attitude one has towards being placed by someone into a structure and the act of giving away the authority one has over oneself. Also, notice that the referent action of hypotassō does not require one to relinquish their will (or the authority one has over himself), but paradidōmi strongly implies that ones will is the object "being placed" into another's control.

As far as core and crucial distinctions are concerned, comparing the ideas of being given and being appointed reveal that hypotassō tends to:

a) Refer more towards the relationship, and respect therefore shown, between the one placed and the placing agent.
b) Refer to the "allowing" of oneself to be placed more than the act of giving away one's authority or position.
c) Recognize a difference between being part of a structure and being given a task.

2.1.2.3 Being placed within an ordered system

In discussing hypotassō, you may have noticed I have avoided using the term hierarchy; using instead "ordered systems" or "structure". In modern English, hierarchy, like submission, denotes a ranking system based on relative position or authority (OED [2020]). When evaluating the deutero-Pauline contexts using hypotassō, and related terms, one can see that a qualitatively simple system of establishing the authority of members is not always in view; rather, the situation implied is more complex, layered, and involves variegated connectivity.

Table 2-7

ID	Reference	Koiné Text / Partial Translation
A	1 Tim. 2:11	γυνὴ ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ μανθανέτω ἐν πάσῃ **ὑποταγῇ** [a] woman must learn quietly with complete **submissiveness**
B	1 Tim. 2:12	διδάσκειν δὲ γυναικὶ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός, but I neither allow a woman to teach nor **domineer** a man
C	Eph. 1:10	**ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι** τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ **to sum up** all things in Christ
D	Col 2:19	καὶ οὐ **κρατῶν** τὴν κεφαλήν and not **adhering** to the head

E	Col 2:20	τί ὡς ζῶντες ἐν κόσμῳ **δογματίζεσθε** why **[do you] submit to** rules and regulations as if you are living in the world
F	Col. 3:15	καὶ ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ **βραβευέτω** ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν and the peace of Christ **rule** in your hearts
G	2 Thes. 2:15	καὶ **κρατεῖτε** τὰς παραδόσεις ἃς ἐδιδάχθητε and **hold** to the traditions that you were taught

Here we touch on two highly controversial terms: authenteō (αὐθεντέω) and kephalē (κεφαλή); while exegesis on these terms and their contexts is outside the scope of this thesis, I will discuss the aspects of their paradigmatic use in context with hypotassō.

In contexts A, B there is a reflexive and antimonic relationship between hypotagē and authentein--in an effort to enable *πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ*, the author does not allow women to διδάσκειν or αὐθεντεῖν men. Understanding the hapax legomenon αὐθεντεῖν is important in understanding the attitude against which it is compared: all submissiveness. Westfall's research shows that,

> *"In the Greek corpus, the verb αὐθεντέω refers to a range of actions that are not restricted to murder or violence. However, the people who are the targets of these actions are harmed, forced against their will (compelled), or at least their self-interest is overridden, because the actions involve the imposition of the subject's will over against the recipients will, ranging from dishonour to lethal force"* (Westfall 2016:291).

Furthermore, this term is found in an *ouk…oude* construction; Kostenberger, after studying these constructions in the NT, found when grouped in such a construction, two terms acquire a synonymity (2016:162). Some modern theologians find that this requires αὐθεντεῖν to be positively evaluated as a part of a normal teaching process; thus, authenteō is interpreted as "the exercise of authority", as teaching (διδάσκειν) is usually presented as a good thing (Grudem 2004:315; Schreiner 2005:308). However, it should be noted that correcting *false teaching* is an established theme within this epistle and the imperatival force of the instructions are directed towards this negative understanding of teaching; thus, interpreting authenteō as something more akin to the "domination" or "usurpation" in falsity (Westfall 2016:289; Belleville 2005:83). Additionally, Keener argues that the instructions in 1 Timothy are to be understood as helping men and women take on the appropriate attitude of a student—quietness, peacefulness, willingness to learn--and while the evidence is not

conclusive, the context does suggest that the author is warning against “domineering use of authority” (1992:108-109).

If we take on the possibility for a negative evaluation of αὐθεντεῖν, then we can understand the commanded attitude of *all submissiveness* (A), as one of allowing oneself to be instructed as a student or at the least being respectful towards the role of being a student. Looking broadly at the various possible contexts for the implications of these instructions to women, Marshall & Towner conclude that “the structure of the passage rules out the theory that the author’s main interest lies in the subordination and silencing of women in the church meeting”, stating that the most probable theme is the gospel, with a strong association between the appropriate attitude prayer and that of learning (2004:416). All of this strongly suggests that to be ἐν πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ, one must deny the impulse to take usurp authority or take control of a situation. It should be noted that these instructions in 1 Timothy 2 are given so that “we may lead a tranquil and quiet life all godliness and dignity” (v2); that men should pray without wrath or dissension (v8), and women should adorn themselves modestly and actively learn in attentiveness, without usurping authority (v9-12). These specific instructions are given to a church whose disharmonious behaviour is undermining apostolic authority (v7); rendering ineffective the prayers and work of that assembly (Marshall & Towner 2004:417); and discrediting the character Jesus Christ and the gospel message (v3-6). This understanding reveals that one’s attitude towards one’s placement within a structure can honour or dishonour the structure itself or the one who is authorized as its organizer. It seems the author’s primary concern is with the public perception and honour given towards the structure’s originating authority (God), mediating agent (Jesus Christ), and authorized organizers (apostles/teachers); not with ranking the members of the assembly.

Moving to kephalē, both Ephesians and Colossians expand on the metaphor of the church and its relationship with Jesus Christ; Bruce characterizes them saying,

> *If in Colossians the role of Christ as Lord over the cosmos has been unfolded, Ephesians carries on the same train of thought by considering the implications of this for the church as the body of Christ” (Bruce 1984:231).*

While I will engage in deeper semantic analyses later, this theme of describing the headship and rulership of Jesus Christ permeates both epistles—clearly established in contexts C, F. In each of these epistles, the household codes which prominently feature hypotassō are found in direct connection to the metaphoric usage of head/body relationship. The hypotassō statements are used as exemplars of how an assembly-member can imitate God

(Eph. 5:1; Col. 3:10), walk wisely in love as Jesus Christ does (Eph. 5:2,15; Col. 3:14), and show gratitude in all things in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ (Eph. 5:20; Col. 3:17). In fact, in expanding context F, the author, saying, “Let the peace of Christ rule in your hearts, to which indeed you were called in one body”, explicitly connects this summing up of things under the headship of Jesus Christ with being ruled by the peace of Jesus Christ.

Looking to contexts D & E, one sees the antithesis of holding to the head, Jesus Christ, exemplified by obligating oneself or submitting oneself to worldly decrees. In context E, the hapax legomena δογματίζεσθε (derived from dogmatizō) denotes conformity to rules and regulations (GLNTSD) and permissiveness towards things decreed by others (BDAG). In this context, there are two primary distinctions between hypotassō and dogmatizō:

1) Dogmatizō is used pejoratively of *man’s* rules and opinions as compared to Christ’s true and divine authority.
2) Dogmatizō is more focused on the decrees being followed rather than on the agent or authority doing the placing.

In summary, this section has focused on evaluating hypotassō in context with two hapax legomena—each deserving of their own in-depth analyses—in order to uncover associative meanings found in these paradigmatic contexts. The semantic features found within are better expressed as negative qualification of hypotassō:

1) An attitude of hypotassō allows peaceful and quiet learning and is not domineering or acting on one’s own authority (A, B, G)
2) The creation of an internal ranking system or hierarchy should not be an assumed feature of hypotassō, as the authority guiding or ruling the system is often in view, and as one’s attitude towards placement in the system honors or dishonors this authority (A, B, C, D, F, G)
3) Hypotassō is used with positive connotations as opposed to other terms that carry the more negative (B, E, G).
4) The action of hypotassō does not support the establishment of man’s laws or result in the establishment or encouragement of man’s leadership, but rather leads towards love and unity in Christ (E, F, G)
5) The process of hypotassō is at least somewhat synonymous with, or at least an important part of, the process of ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι, the summing up or recapitulation of people into the Lordship of Jesus Christ (C, D, F, G).

2.1.2.4 Distinction between obedience and subjection

In this author's view, the discussion on the modern conflation between obedience and submission needs to be continued and continually developed[9], however, the full development of this argument is outside the scope of this thesis. Within scope, however, is a look at how ὑπακούω (hypakouō) and πειθαρχέω (peitharcheō) are used in context with hypotassō.

Table 2-8

ID	Reference	Koiné Text / Partial Translation
A	2 Tim. 3:2	γονεῦσιν **ἀπειθεῖς** **disobedient** to parents
B	Eph. 2:2	ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς **ἀπειθείας** in the sons of **disobedience**
C	Eph. 5:6	ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς **ἀπειθείας** on the sons of **disobedience**
D	Col. 3:6	[ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς **ἀπειθείας**] upon the sons of disobedience
E	Titus 1:16	βδελυκτοὶ ὄντες καὶ **ἀπειθεῖς** καὶ πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἀδόκιμοι they are detestable and disobedient and unqualified for any good work
F	Titus 3:1	πειθαρχεῖν, πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἑτοίμους εἶναι, to be obedient, to be ready for every good work
G	Titus 3:3	Ἦμεν γάρ ποτε καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀνόητοι, **ἀπειθεῖς**, πλανώμενοι For we also were once foolish, disobedient, misled
H	2 Thes. 1:8	καὶ τοῖς μὴ **ὑπακούουσιν** τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ and those who do not **obey** the gospel of our Lord Jesus
I	2 Thes. 3:14	εἰ δέ τις οὐχ **ὑπακούει** τῷ λόγῳ ἡμῶν διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς but if one does not **obey** the our word in the letter
J	Eph. 6:1	Τὰ τέκνα, **ὑπακούετε** τοῖς γονεῦσιν ὑμῶν [ἐν κυρίῳ] Children, **obey** your parents [in the Lord]
K	Eph. 6:5	Οἱ δοῦλοι, **ὑπακούετε** τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις Slaves, **obey** those [who], in flesh, [are] masters
L	Col. 3:20	Τὰ τέκνα, **ὑπακούετε** τοῖς γονεῦσιν κατὰ πάντα Children, **obey** your parents in everything
M	Col. 3:22	Οἱ δοῦλοι, **ὑπακούετε** κατὰ πάντα τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις Slaves, **obey** those [who], in flesh, [are] masters in everything

In Titus 3:1, the author uses the idea of peitharcheō as the practice of hypotassō. Marshall & Towner summarize Delling, Barrett, and Holtzman, explaining that this collocation is almost cliché, and that while servility is not a requisite of recognizing authority, obedience is the normal pattern within this civic context (2004:300-301). This relationship highlights both the basis for the modern conflation and a distinction. Obedience focusses on one's

[9] The US-based, National Association for Christian Recovery, presents the case that abusers almost always act from a place of assumed, legitimate authority, and in Christian relationships the claim is often that the Bible justifies the abuse as legitimate response to disobedience (NACR [2020]). Additionally, Westenberg shows how the religious language of submission is used to justify domestic violence in Christian relationships (2017).

actions—what one does in response to commands or rules; while submission implies recognition of and attitude towards being placed in a structure. In context F, it should be noted that πειθαρχεῖν and εἶναι are active infinities, while in the textually preceding context 7 (Table 2-1), ὑποτάσσεσθαι is a passive or middle infinitive (middle voice supported by UBS5). These progressive infinitives—to recognize your subjection, to obey, to be ready for good works—are an expression of a traditional Hellenistic-Jewish ethos and serve the purpose of calling the Christian to exemplary citizenship and to "to live in such a way that the fruit of the new life in Christ is manifested in tangible ways in this mundane context" (Marshall and Towner 2004:302). Even within the complex, hierarchical contexts of ethnicity and social standing in the 1st century, understanding hypotassō requires a view of agency and of individual will; put differently, it is not for the purpose of glorifying the government or for the purpose of being made into mindless servants that Christians are "made subjects" or "submissive", but rather, in view of such an attitude, one can negotiate the social systems with an intentional pursuit of the love, peace, humility, and unity seen in Jesus Christ.

Obedience is commonly referred to using ὑπακούω, appearing in household codes relating to children and slaves (J, K, L, M). While these contexts are not in direct vicinity of hypotassō, there are semantic connections with code use and family instructions through the deutero-Pauline corpus. As discussed in §2.1.2.1, the author of 1 Timothy lists the ability to "keep children submissive" as a requirement for leadership within a church assembly. In the codes, more active language is used: children are told to be obedient, and fathers are told to "not provoke the children to anger" or aggravate them, but to rather bring them up in the "discipline and instruction of the Lord" (Eph. 6). If we add in Titus' civic trifecta of recognize, obey, and be ready, a clear pattern of associative semantics begins to emerge. Wright eloquently summarizes this pattern, arguing that while it is true that both Jews and pagans had similar household rules, one cannot assume that the author is instructing conformity to worldly ethics—as, in fact, the deutero-Pauline (and Pauline) epistles are full of warnings against doing this very thing. One's position in society and the ethics one has been taught are but a starting point; Wright says, "the rule of life which will restore that image to its proper glory need not scrap all non-Christian values and begin over again, but will be able to build on, and bring to full maturity, what is best in the world outside the church" (1986:151). While society may rely on the impartation of low position to marginalize and dehumanize, "Christ releases you to be truly human, and you must now learn to express your true self according to the divine pattern, not in self-assertion but in self-giving "(151-152). While it is common for household codes to instruct the one in a lesser position—

ostensibly to keep them there—in Ephesians, the codes are expanded to include instructions to fathers, masters, and husbands. In effect, their culturally assumed power is relativized as the church should have "God as the paterfamilias, or patron, and [promote] reciprocity among [its] members" (Westfall 2016:243). Mouton also argues for the NT household codes to generally be understood as transformative in intent, stating, "while it seems to invite its recipients to identify with the familiar ethos of their traditional household culture, it also seems to estrange, alienate them from (life-denying aspects of) that culture by reminding them of their radically alternative orientation in Christ" (2015:177). Through all of this, obedience is but one expression of submission; a response which ontologically recognizes of authority; and, in-and-of-itself is an action which gives honor, shows respect, and gives perceptibility to an inward attitude.

Contexts A, B, C, D, E, and G are examples of common, negative derivatives of πείθομαι, regularly translated as "disobedience", and I included them to show that in the deutero-Pauline epistles, there is not a regular, direct association of disobedience and a lack of submission. The idiom "sons of disobedience" (B, C, D) does not simply mean "anyone who is disobedient" but is a Semitic phrase referring to those who have rejected God and upon whom His wrath will be poured (Travis 1974:§Eph 2:2). While not used idiomatically, contexts A, E, G all use the term in lists describing detestable people who have rejected God and are opposed to Him; the GLNTSD states that the term is used to refer to people who "refuse to believe the Christian message" (§31.107).

While there is a clear need to further explore the conflation of submission and obedience, there are several semantic features which can be seen in looking at the paradigmatic relationships between ὑπακούω/πειθαρχέω and hypotassō:

1) Obedience is the normal and even expected ethical response to hypotassō.
2) Hypotassō is something that places someone into an ordered structure of relationships, and one's attitudes towards and actions from that position are primarily a matter of honor towards the agent who did the *placing;* and in a Christian context, obedience is exemplary of one's attitude towards the gospel message and Jesus Christ;
3) The language of obedience and submission was used as starting point for creating a new understanding of family order, social responsibility, and ruling authority within the early church.

4) Hypotassō seems to refer more towards one's internal attitudes and the intended direction of respect within a structure of relationships, while obedience tends towards referring to actions taken in response to commands or rules given by others.

2.2 Semantic analyses in Ephesians

Having categorized distinctions apparent in the varied uses of hypotassō within the deutero-Pauline corpus, and having analyzed the paradigmatic relationships therein, we can look more closely at each individual context in order to clarify both denotative and associative semantics. First, we will look at contexts within Ephesians.

2.2.1 Issues related to designative and associative context in Ephesians

As has been established, it is unlikely Ephesians was written directly to the church in Ephesus as a personal letter from Paul (Bruce 1984:230; Lincoln 1990:lxxxiii; Klein 2006:34). Due to its connections with Colossians, formal and referential associations with Paul and Pauline church, and references from the early church fathers, Lincoln holds the most likely destination for this epistle was Gentile churches in Asia Minor. He, applying Kennedy's approach, contends that in the absence of specific cultural and temporal placement, rhetorical criticism is the most useful analytical tool for teasing out the author's purposes in composing Ephesians (1990: lxxvii). His analysis in the World Biblical Commentary (WBC) agrees with the majority of modern scholarship, arguing for deutero-Pauline authorship in the late 1st century CE. In this analysis he summarizes that the recipients, being second-generation Pauline Christians, found themselves with faded hope regarding an imminent Parousia; and in response to Paul's martyrdom and the fall of Jerusalem, there was a "deficient sense of all they already had" leading to a decreased awareness of the Church's purpose and place in history (specifically in relationship to Israel), while needing to adapt to "extended co-existence" with their surrounding milieu (1990:lxxxv).

This raises an interesting conundrum in thinking through contextual issues surrounding an understanding of hypotassō—should we attempt to understand the authorial perspective or the recipients'? Even though there is agreement in regarding converted gentiles in Asia Minor as the primary recipients, does that mean ideas should be interpreted through a Hellenistic hermeneutic or does the text maintain a Pauline Jewishness about it? There has been increasing research showing strong conceptual and linguistic connection between sectarian Qumran documents and some NT documents (deSilva 2004:720; MacDonald

2008:304; Fitzmyer 1988:615-616; Regev 2018:615-620). Importantly, Regev found that the author of Ephesians uses temple terminology to create metaphors distinct in ecclesiology from authentic Pauline temple metaphors. The metaphoric imagery in Ephesians—which establishes Christ, and finding identity in Him, as foundational to the church built upon it—is ideologically closer to the Community Document's (1QS) identifying a community as a replacement for the temple than to the authentic Pauline conception of church which seems to stand alone (Regev 2018:618). Additionally, the dualistic representations of mankind in Ephesians open the door to authorial knowledge of Qumran documents. At the very least, this research affirms deSilva's statements "[encouraging] students of any New Testament text to consider multiple streams of both Jewish and Greco-Roman traditions informing the author and the reading of the text, rather than privileging one such stream exclusively as the background" (2004:725). In the absence of verifiable knowledge on the origin of the text, Lincoln's assertion to search for meaning in its rhetoric seems wise, so I will look for semantics by trying to understand what the author is teaching. That the author was packaging a variety of Jewish thought into a more Hellenistic package seems likely; but the language and arguments within do not seem to be as clearly rooted in the Jewish worldview as the genuine letters of Paul himself.

Despite the academic split on authorship, Ephesians is clearly rooted in Pauline thought, Bruce asserting that "when we consider how the main themes and images of Ephesians are rooted in the earlier Pauline letters, there is little need to seek extraneous sources for them" (1984:236). This said, there are good questions that have confounded scholars for centuries as to the language, timing, structure, theology, and ecclesiology in the text, but even when taking a stance for deutero-Pauline authorship, one can work from Meade's conclusion that "Ephesians can be seen as a creative attempt to secure the Pauline heritage […] by the actualization of the apostolic doctrine and lifestyle" and that Paul's name is used as "primarily an assertion of authoritative Pauline tradition, not of literary origin" (1986:153-157). Ephesians was written to be instructive to the universal church and the teachings are rooted in a Pauline worldview, even if they were not written by him directly.

The epistle seems to be written to be read aloud—the epistolary style is part of the pseudonymous nature of the letter—clearly connecting the work to the Pauline tradition—and the assemblies are complicit in understanding the communication as such (Lincoln 1988: lxxi). This "liturgical character of this part is no doubt responsible for the plerophoric style" (Bruce 1984:241). In fact, Bruce affirms Dodd in saying that Ephesians is not only the quintessence of Paulinism but its crown (229). Ephesians contains two primary parts: the

first focussed on doctrine, the second hortatory, both intimately tied together by the theme of unity which pervades the book (Graham 2008:13). Both sections contain hypotassō and will be looked at in turn.

2.2.2 Ephesians 1:22

*καὶ πάντα **ὑπέταξεν** ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, (UBS5)*

And He put all things in subjection under His feet, and gave Him as head over all things to the church (NASB)

This first use of hypotassō in Ephesians is the only active use of the verb in the entire deutero-Pauline corpus; it is also the only use directly cited from the LXX: Psalm 8:7 (LXX). There is not a lot of disagreement as to the implied meaning of this verse, nor it's source. The idea of people or things being placed under feet (*ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας*) is based on a well-known, ancient idiom which is to be understood in the classical context of honoring and submission as a show of power and exaltation over a fallen foe (Graham 2008:94-95). Both in Eph. 1:22 and Psalm 8:7, a divine authority is the subject of the verb, thus is the one with authority to do the arranging/putting, and as a result, those things placed "under someone's feet" are now under the dominion of that person[10].

So, the collocation of hypotassō with "hypo tous podas" definitely creates the implications of authority and subjection usually associated with hypotassō. However, these implications seem to arise from the "under his feet" idiom rather than the verb used. The usage of hypotassō keeps the focus on God as the one with ultimate authority for arrangement, and the idiom designates the direction or placement of the objects being acted against. In other words, the idea that the authority to rule was given to Christ is implied by the idiom "under his feet" more so than the use of the verb hypotassō.

There are some additional considerations in thinking through this LXX quotation in this thanksgiving discourse opening Ephesians. Both the meaning of this statement and the use of Psalm 8 throughout the NT help clarify a framework for understanding the role of hypotassō in the rest of the book. Lincoln argues that here in v22 "the didactic and paraenetic thrust of the letter is more clearly introduced" in that the readers must understand the extent and completeness of God's power and authority—that they realize He uses His

[10] . Bruce, and others, elaborates on this understanding explaining how Psalm 8 is referencing Genesis 1:26 where God gives dominion over all creation to mankind (Bruce 1984:274; Arnold 2010:114).

power to the church's advantage as it is in Christ for believers and the sovereignty given to Christ "is exercised on behalf of the Church" (1990:53-54). Additionally, Bruce explains there is distinction in the character of submission between Christ's supremacy expressed through the LXX Psalm and his headship over the church; namely that force characterizes subjection while love and sanctification characterize headship (1984:275). Interestingly, in studying Biblical uses of Psalm 8, Retief shows all NT usages of Psalm 8:6 as Messianic in intent. In Heb. 2, 1 Cor. 15, and Eph. 1, the authors use the idea of God putting all things under *his* feet to connect Jesus Christ with mankind and that this "putting" is a part of God's cosmic, Messianic plan for mankind through the Christ (Retief 2014:1004). In 1 Cor. 15, Paul provides the most elaborate description for understanding how Psalm 8:6 works in the Messianic plan, stating that in subjecting all things to Christ, God Himself is not subjected, and that this process of subjection leads to Christ being subjected to God, with the final goal "that God may be all in all" (1 Cor. 15:28c). The picture arising from Ephesians 1 is that God is ordering the universe on many levels, in many ways—that Jesus Christ is the agent through which God's universal plan will be completed—and that the universal church benefits from all that God is doing. The "now-not yet" eschatology is formalized here at the end of chapter 1, and it is important to keep this cosmic context in mind as one reads the rest of the epistle.

I will discuss the LXX context of Psalm 8 later, but the designative and associative features of hypotassō, are clarified in the metaphor applied in Eph. 1:22. This verse establishes Jesus Christ as the "supreme head" over all (Bruce 1984:276) who is then given to the church. This idiom finds meaning in its associations with Psalm 8 and as common part of both Semitic and Hellenistic vernacular. Rhetorically, this verse focusses the reader on God's cosmic plan for the universe and connects Jesus Christ and the church. As for the term hypotassō itself, it is important to note the semantic function in this context—hypotassō, in active indicative form, seems to summarize actions taken by God in creating an arrangement of things, or put differently, establishing a unity of disparate things. In and of itself, the term does not seem to infer the transfer of authority or even necessarily permanence—in that the cosmic process includes different types, purposes, and timings for various placements. These subtle distinctions are important for two reasons:

1) allowing hypotassō to always take on the semantic feature of "something being placed underfoot" is restricting one's interpretation from an idiomatic reference found less commonly than the term's non-idiomatic and contemporary usage.

2) allowing oneself to understand hypotassō as transferring authority (not just the act of arranging or placing) creates a shift in understanding the force and focus of this discourse away from the one doing the ordering.

So, even though hypotassō is easy-to-understand in this context, and can even include forceful ideas (i.e. submit, subject, conquer), we have begun to explore the rhetorical framework of the epistle which will be useful in analyzing the subsequent uses of hypotassō in Ephesians.

2.2.3 Ephesians 5:21-24

*Ὑποτασσόμενοι **Ὑποτασσόμενοι** ἀλλήλοις ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ, αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ […] ἀλλ' ὡς ἡ ἐκκλησία **ὑποτάσσεται** τῷ Χριστῷ, οὕτως καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἐν παντί (UBS5).*
and be subject to one another in the fear of Christ. Wives, be subject to your own husbands, as to the Lord. […] But as the church is subject to Christ, so also the wives ought to be to their husbands in everything (NASB)

In many ways, this passage is the centrepiece of this study, as the text and translations of Ephesians 5:15-33 highlight the effect of seeming semantic minutia in shaping centuries of understanding. As this research is not a topical study on "submission" but a close look at the use of hypotassō, I will be highlighting a few contextual clues and looking at the metaphorical ideas expanded upon in this text, rather than fully exploring obedience and submission in families and community (though, this is research that should be expanded in the future).

In this context, hypotassō is used as a passive or middle imperative participle, and this use is found at the end of a list of five participles explaining what it means to be filled with the Spirt (v18). The direct context in question is usually translated into English using the term submission or subjection: "be subject to one another in fear (reverence/RSV) of Christ" (NASB); or, "submitting to one another in reverence of Christ" (ESV). This statement transitions from the topic of being filled with the Spirit to a set of household codes, and as Lincoln summarizes, teaches "If believers are filled with the Spirit, this should manifest itself in their mutual submission" (1990:365). Connecting this passage with Phil. 2, Bruce explains "mutual submissiveness" by saying, "Christians should not be self-assertive, each insisting

on getting his or her own way" (1984:382). While these may be good teachings, I find myself wondering if "*submitting* to each other" is really what is in view here?

To understand *Ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις* as "submitting to each other" creates a difficult framework for understanding the household codes which follow (Eph. 5:22-6:9), and also shifts the parenetic thrust of the entire epistle. Here we can start to see the interpretational effects of a seemingly subtle semantic difference. The Oxford English Dictionary defines submit (especially in context of human relationship) as to "accept or yield to a superior force or to the authority or will of another person" ([OED [2020]). The implications of submission change drastically based on the identity of the person to whom one is accepting or yielding; and the English word *submit* denotes that the object of the verb is the one to whom the subject is submitting. So, one tends to read "submitting to each other" as giving authority to each other or giving up one's will to another person—submit glosses over the implicit idea of agency that is inherent to hypotassō. This idea of attributing authority to another person in a hierarchy, rather than to God, is oppositional to the rest of the language and teaching within Ephesians.

It is well attested that hypotassō is commonly used as submission language in hierarchical societies (including Hellenistic Asia), and Osiek notes that it "carries connotations of respectful rather than servile yielding, but very definitely of inferior subject to authoritative superior" (2002:31). For this present argument, I want to suggest that the English term *submission* implies "yielding to the authority of the one under whom you are placed", the associative meanings of *hypotassō* are closer to "yielding to the authority of the one who has placed you" and as we look closer, we will see associations with "honoring", "supporting", "upholding", or even simple "connectedness". I want to highlight a few contextual ideas emerging from the Ephesians text to support this interpretation.

1) Hypotassō is used in a list of participles describing how one fulfills the imperative to be filled with the Spirit (5:18-21), and this list is set in opposition to "getting drunk on wine". The other participles are "speaking together", "singing", "making melody", and "giving thanks [to God in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ]". All these ideas revolve around working together, mutuality, interaction, and unity in speech in a community. Referencing v5:2, Osiek notes the sacrificial theme underlying this discourse (2002:31), and I think it is interesting that these participles describe sacrifices of praise which are the "fruit of lips that acknowledge His name" (Heb. 13:15-16). In context of this list, hypotassō seems to take on connotations of allowing oneself to be assigned together with others in sacrificial tasks and in a unified identity. The focus

seems to be on the togetherness and mutual dependence that comes from unifying in purpose to praise God.

2) This context finds itself in the midst of several polemic distinctions being made by the author. Eph. 5:1 imperatively states that, as ones beloved, the readers should be imitators of God. This command is followed by lists of behaviors and attitudes which distinguish between saints and evildoers, and these lists are centered around the idea that they "were formerly darkness, but now [they] are Light in the Lord; [they should] walk as children of Light" (v8, NASB). Here we see that their old patterns of life need to be changed to something different. This is idea of imitating God, not man, and walking in love not "in deeds of darkness" (v11) should permeate our interpretation of *Ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις* and the household codes that follow.

3) The complete thought also helps add context to our understanding. The readers are instructed to *Ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ*. The term "fear of God" appears in both the OT and NT to describe the stance of those who acknowledge God's sovereignty (Klein 2006:147). Similarly, here, the readers are instructed to *Ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις* in order to acknowledge Christ's sovereignty. It is for Christ's honor and in response to God's authority that readers should allow themselves to be arranged with one another.

4) The two uses of hypotassō in this context are placed in a transition from a dualistic parenetic into a set of household codes. I am constrained in this thesis from exploring the full implications of the household codes, but it is important to remember that "the theological arguments of New Testament authors cannot be divorced from the implications of a socio-cultural context where people's lifestyles, ethos, and communities were imbued with domination and submission" (Punt 2013:9). Punt argues that NT texts "emerged from a context where human domination and submission were privileged, rather than human dignity, where questions prevailed about obligations rather than rights, where dignity was reserved and the prized possession of a few people only" (2013:7). Dudrey also argues for the wide-spread (near universality) of the ancient household ideologies codified in Aristotelian literature (1999:28-28)—however, recognizing that submission language embodied in the household codes was endemic to society, does not mean that the author of

Ephesians was simply enforcing them. It does not make sense for the author to transition from a section describing the sinful practices of the world from which Christians have been saved directly into a reinforcement of the world's social order. However, there is verisimilitude in the instruction when one understands hypotassō as allowing oneself to be ordered, arranged, or placed by God into His social structures which are different than the world's. Dudrey concludes that "not to repress the socially downtrodden, but to transform spiritually all who are in Christ" (1999:41)—arguing the God, as the great paterfamilias (Eph. 3:14), has ordered the church in such a way to bring glory and honor to Christ. Interestingly, Westfall explores at length the flattening of social hierarchy in these codes, arguing that the author gives masculine tasks to women, feminine tasks to men, and that the household codes in Ephesians show the author "was [clearly] not committed to defending the Greco-Roman gender roles […] he was attempting to equip male and female believers to follow Christ" (2016:58). Fee also argues that even though the household codes are ubiquitously understood, and use language of domination, the author's intent is made clear in how he addresses oppressed first, but instead of giving them instructions (as is the norm in household codes), gives new instructions to the power-holder in the relationship (2002:4). In this context, what the author "obviously did not do was to demolish the structures and create new ones. What was radical lay in his urging those who are filled with the Spirit and worship Christ as Lord to have totally transformed relationships within the household" (Fee 2002:8). The household codes are not used to reinforce Hellenistic social order as the implementation of divine order, rather they are instructions which seem to redefine equality, mutuality, and unity within the family of God—household codes are a topic which will be visited upon later in this thesis.

5) In the midst of the berakah near the beginning of the epistle, the author makes a profound statement regarding God's ordering and administration (οἰκονομίαν) of the fullness of the times equating it to the ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ (UBS5)—the "summing up of all things in the Christ". Lincoln summarizes this statement, saying, "the mystery which has been disclosed to believers in accordance with God's purpose for history is his summing up of all things in Christ" (1990:32). While ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι is not actually derived from κεφαλή (BDAG, Lincoln 1990:32, Graham 2008:41), the use of the term here "implies that God is not only the initiator of the action but that he acts in his own interest in this program of uniting everything together in Christ"—it should be noted that this "summing up" or "unifying"

being done by God is appositional to his “administration”, meaning, that this unifying effort is the implementation of God’s “plan which involves a set of arrangements” (Lincoln 1990:33, Louw-Nida 1996: §30.68). Klein neatly summarizes this influential context saying, “In Christ, God achieves his agelong goal of overcoming and eliminating all barriers that separate people from each other and from God” (2006:52). As Lincoln notes, “It is both legitimate and illuminating to place the thought of 1:10 in the context of the whole letter and link it with other passages in which a relation between the cosmos and Christ is posited” (1990:33). Later, throughout the epistle, the author develops a body/head metaphor and uses it to posit this very relationship.

6) Semantic analyses of κεφαλή abound, and the idea of headship is directly connected with hypotassō in Eph. 5:23-24. So here, an academically and contextually informed understanding of kephalē becomes vital to understanding the associative semantics of hypotassō. The argument over if kephalē, literally “head” (BDAG), metaphorically denotes “authority over” or “source of” has come to a seeming stalemate. Reading either of these translations into a passage can drastically affect one’s interpretation. Westfall notes that reading “authority” into kephalē is deeply engrained in modern thought as we see the head as holding the brain, the controller of the body, and use phrases like “head of the household” or “head of state”. However, she argues that these associations were not a part of Greek culture or language, as that the vast majority of kephalē usages denote an anatomical head or are synecdoche for a whole person (2016:38-39). She finds very little authority language used in conjunction with Biblical kephalē metaphors to justify constraining one’s interpretation to the idea of rulership. Against this idea, Lincoln (Grudem, and others) argue that in Ephesians, the context of “mutual submission”, household codes, and the fact that v1:22 quotes Psalm 8 in saying that God has made Christ the “head over all things” that one must understand kephalē as *primarily* dealing with authority (1990:370; Klein 2006:155). In arguing for understanding kephalē as “prominent”, Cervin evaluated ancient and Hellenistic uses, concluding that no pre-NT uses denoted “source” and that while it is true that in Platonic philosophy, the head controls the body, that the soul is actually the aspect of one’s self with authority or rulership (2006:§5. Plato). It is also interesting to note that the LSJ does not attribute authority or rulership to any sense of κεφᾰλή.

Many commentators discuss the relationship between rosh (ראש) and kephalē (Bedale 1954:212-214, Wolters 2011:137, Lincoln 1990:369). Wolters notes the LXX generally translates rosh as archon, but not uncommonly as kephalē. Though he does summarize his analysis, quoting Muraoka, saying that kephalē does sometimes mean "he who or that which plays a leading role" (2011:144). This connects with Cervin's conclusion that instigating an event or being prominent within an event does not necessitate authority or rulership (2006:§7. The Septuagint). So, while there is definitely a basis for attributing "authority" to kephalē in Semitic thought, to argue that kephalē always and only refers to "one with authority" is not supported by the source texts. Also, the Semitic connection between rosh and kephalē undermines "source" as the basic meaning. Wolters notes the unique usage of kephalē in the Ephesians head/body metaphor, saying "It seems that there is no precedent at all for this striking Pauline image" (2011:147).

As we look at the broader context, Bedale's comment that it "seems hardly possible that St. Paul[11] could use κεφαλή in the immediate context of σῶμα without any conscious reference at all to the anatomical image thereby evoked" seem apropos. In fact, in several earlier verses, the head/body anatomical metaphor is developed and expounded (1:22-23, 2:16, 3:6, 4:12-16). The author explains the nature of this head/body relationship in 4:16, saying, "but speaking the truth in love, we are to grow up in all aspects into Him who is the head, even Christ, from whom the whole body, being fitted and held together by what every joint supplies, according to the proper working of each individual part, causes the growth of the body for the building up of itself in love" (NASB). Here there is a clear idea of a physical body, holding itself together through each part doing its assigned job, growing upward into its head, which is also the source of its growth. As is noted by Cervin, there is a range of Hellenistic, philosophical belief as to the role of the head in the body (2006:§6), and it is impossible to determine exactly which one is being purported here, but it is worth noting that the author describes the head/body relationship as two-way. There is a collection of body parts, knit together and doing work to uphold the most prominent and important part, the head; and at the same time, the head is providing what is needed for the body to thrive. This can include directions and instruction, but it can also imply energy, protection, or as is clearly stated, love.

[11] Bedale assuming Pauline authorship of Ephesians.

Analyzing these contextual clues give insight to the semantic range of hypotassō in this passage. Here there is a confluence of metaphors, cultural ideology, and transformational instruction; and there is no compelling reason to limit hypotassō to one role within these connections. Hypotassō definitely concerns an ordering or placement within spiritual and socials structure being done by God; and it has to do with believers' connections and relationships to one another. However, limiting our understanding of this divine ordering to prioritize the semantic feature of "submission to other people" seems to belittle, and even ignore, the implicit ideas that in being arranged together we are to act in a way unifies us to bring honor, glory, and praise Christ. The God-intended purpose of hypotassō prioritizes service, obedience, respect, and reciprocity towards and with Christ, not to others. Simply put, understanding hypotassō *only* as submitting to another or subjecting yourself to another does not do justice to the richly layered, deeply cultural, and radically transformational meaning found within this text.

Now, I must give special mention to Ephesians 5:22:

αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ (UBS5) (the) wives to their own husbands as to the Lord
Wives, be subject to your husbands, as to the Lord. (RSV) Wives, be subject to your own husbands, as to the Lord. (NASB) Wives, submit to your own husbands, as to the Lord (ESV) Wives, submit yourselves to your own husbands as you do to the Lord. (NIV) Wives, submit to your own husbands, as to the Lord (NKJV/KJV) Wives, submit yourselves to your husbands as to the Lord. (GNT)

At a first glance, you might note that this verse is not a direct context listed in Table 2-1, and this is because hypotassō does not appear in the source text[12]. While there are textual variants which place a form of hypotassō into the verse (ὑποτασσέσθωσαν in ***א*** A I P; and ὑποτάσσεσθε in D F G), the shorter reading is given a {B} reading in the UBS5 apparatus (UBS5*). Best also argues for the shorter reading on account of quality and age of the textual witnesses, and that lectionary use of the verse required the later insertion (1998:531).

As the editors of the UBS5 give a high rating to the shorter reading, it is hard not to see anachronistic tradition being preserved in modern commentary. Bruce notes that the

[12] It is also noteworthy that many translations add a sub-heading reinforcing the idea of a command given to wives to submit, thus breaking up a single thought and re-framing the imperative in a different context.

imperative is supplied in the previous verse (a passive or middle participle) and dismisses the ἰδίοις as exhausted and as making no special emphasis (1984:383). Lincoln concludes that even though the surrounding context does not demand for the verb hypotassō to be inserted; and even though submission, subordination, and obedience are not true synonyms; and even though the nature of submission changes depending on the social relationship in question; and even though "to submit" is a broad term; that the author clearly intended for v22 to be a direct command towards wives to be submissive, since hypotassō may well mean being obedient to another, and with a glad heart it is "called for not just because it is the role society has allotted her but because this is the way she can serve her Lord" (1990:36). Most commentaries show similar semantic gymnastics used to change the middle/passive imperatival force of Ὑποτασσόμενοι into an active imperative towards wives.

I think the idea of "wives to your own husbands" is certainly grammatically connected to the hypotassō in the previous verse (as the UBS5 has it as one sentence). To insert a different verb and sense of the verb into the translations, while removing an adjective, is not being honest to the original. In the context of a community being instructed in how to be unified, there is certainly room to make an argument that the direction of the connection of marriage is to be upheld—in other words, mutual submission should not be used to justify infidelity. This clause seems to be a simple upholding of the idea of chastity, not a refocused command to wives. Interestingly, Logan notes that there is a distinct disparity in way the household codes are understood when compared to the rest of Ephesians regarding the exercise of power. Understanding these codes in a way that reinforces social hierarchy is counter to the prominent themes of "love-as-empowerment", reciprocity and mutuality, and unity. This misinterpretation itself is reinforced by the insertion of a redirected imperative, and "this leaves a somewhat confused impression, and makes it at least possible that the code […] may be directed towards something other than a straightforward re-statement of hierarchy" (Logan 2018:263). All of this is simply to show an example where a potentially limited or incorrect understanding of hypotassō has created confusion and misunderstanding in understanding the primary focus of the text. Ephesians 5:22 is often quoted and expounded on as the Biblical command for wives to submit to their husbands, but this command is not given in this form here, and its translation has created a lasting misinterpretation of the text which seems to dilute and divert the clear and oft restated intentions of the author.

Thus far, I have been highlighting associative and contextual issues that surround understanding hypotassō in Ephesians 5:21-24. There are layers of literary metaphors and

cultural issues which heavily inform one's interpretation of this passage. To summarize and clarify the semantic features arising in this discussion, hypotassō:

1) Tends to be used reflexively or passively and describes either the state being placed into systematic social relationships, or as describing one's attitude or response to being placed into such a system—which is closely related to the placing of oneself into such a system.
2) Denotes an action that can be reacted to in such a way that shows reverence or honor to the one to whom you are connected.
3) Does not seem to be itself used as a metaphor but is used within metaphors used both to describe God's actions in ordering and arranging the cosmos; and, to describe a connectedness or relationship between people.
4) Describes a relationship which leads to unity and interconnectedness between people—compared to the relationship of a body and its head.
5) Does not require denotation of authority, but absolutely is not devoid of it either.
6) Receives something of a positive evaluation as its result be increased reverence, honor, glory, and gratitude in an honor/reciprocity system.

When thinking through these associative contexts, I want to end with the same Torahic quote and association that the author of Ephesians uses to close his discussion on marriage, "For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and shall be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh. This mystery is great; but I am speaking with reference to Christ and the church" (Eph. 5:32-33 NASB). Jesus (Matt. 19:3-9; Mark 10:6-12) and Paul (1 Cor. 6:16-17) both use Gen. 2:24 as a Scriptural basis for understanding marriage; carrying on in this tradition, the author of Ephesians describes the relationship between Christ and the church in marriage terms. Is it more likely that the author is trying to teach believers living in Asia Minor to adopt the surrounding, Hellenistic household codes or quoting the Torah, Jesus, and Paul in an effort to transform their inherited worldview to see this relationship in a new light based on Scripture? In this light, it seems hypotassō is more connected to and focused on this process of unifying in purpose, joining into identity, and increasing oneness in the Spirit, all according to the will and authority of God, more-so than enforcing the hierarchies or contracts of man.

2.3 Semantic analyses in Colossians

Ephesians and Colossians are mysteriously and intrinsically linked together; and while solutions to the puzzles of priority and authorship have yet to be universally accepted (Pao 2012:21-23), we can still evaluate a range of designative and associative semantics for hypotassō in Colossians—especially since there is only one context in the epistle.

2.3.1 Issues related to designative and associative context in Colossians

While there is only one context to evaluate within Colossians, the epistle's relationship to Ephesians and its regional connection to Asia Minor allow us space to explore a couple cultural associations from a different perspective. In agreeance with majority scholarship, I find that Colossians was the precursor to Ephesians—though direct Pauline authorship can be justly questioned. After evaluating the arguments for and against the priority of Ephesians, Lincoln concludes that Colossians must have been written first, and towards a specific situation in Asia Minor, and that Ephesians was a later development and expansion written with "a free and creative dependence, not a slavish imitation or copying" of Colossians (1990:lv). In discussing the priority of Colossians, Pao and Bruce both conclude that there is insufficient evidence to break from the tradition of Pauline authorship (Pao 2012:23; Bruce 1984:32). This said, O'Brien[13] admits the pertinency and grounds for questioning direct Pauline authorship, concluding that "differences of emphasis there are, but these are best interpreted as being called forth by the circumstances at Colossae" (O'Brien 1982:xlix). This said, he adds that more research should be done into Paul's use of associates as the ideas of the development of a Pauline school or Paul's own hand in directing apostolic succession are not yet fully understood. Deciding on Pauline authorship is not necessary for evaluating hypotassō, but it does make dating this context difficult; however, we can look at this term in its rhetorical and theological setting in this occasional epistle.

The so-called "Colossians heresy" is the aforementioned occasion for this epistle, and while an understanding of all the deducible specifics of the heresy are beyond the scope of this thesis, there are a few key points that guide our understanding of Colossian's instructive elements:

[13] O'Brien argues for Pauline authorship, but handles Lohse & Schwiezer fairly and extensively.

1) The heresy should not be understood simply as either “Gnosticism” or “Judaism”. The author indicates some of the ideologies being refuted in chapter 2, and these includes notably Jewish ideas of sabbath and circumcision (Bruce 1984:19), as well as mystical elements which share terminology and ideology with Gnosticism (Bruce 1984:19-20; O’Brien 1982:xli; Pao 2012:102). Bruce concludes that, “the Colossian heresy was basically Jewish, it is not the straightforward Judaizing legalism of Galatians that is envisaged in Colossians, but a form of mysticism which tempted its adepts to look on themselves as a spiritual elite” (1984:22).
2) In discussing the relationship between Qumran and “Gnosticism”, Klawans reminds us that religious and social connections in the ancient world were complex, and we cannot rely on the “idealized generalizations” of ancient authors as being absolute, especially when discussing broadly dispersed groups and ideas, stating, “actual religious movements and phenomena are always messier, more complicated and varied than any abstract, brief, descriptive snap-shot. It is a mistake to confuse description with reality” (Klawans 2016:70). Identifying the exact group or philosophy is not so important as to understand the kind of thinking being refuted and the arguments being countered. O’Brien, citing Hooker, describes a situation in Colossae where the young church was struggling against “the beliefs and practices of their pagan and Jewish neighbours” (1982:xxxi), and that various levels of syncretism were pulling the assembly in differing ideological directions, and the author’s recourse was to undermine these complex human traditions with an authorized, realized, authentic, and reliable tradition of Christ (O’Brien 1982:xxxviii; Bruce 1984:22).
3) The Christological Hymn (Col. 1:15-20) is the backbone of the epistle, and any hermeneutical endeavour to understand the parenesis in Colossians need to be rooted in the epistles introductory hymn—the author’s “lengthy prayer leads up to the hymn, while the words which immediately follow take up phrases and ideas from it and apply the truths to the readers. Indeed, the paragraph undergirds the whole letter; remove it and a serious dislocation occurs” (O’Brien 1982: 62). Bruce summarizes this well, saying, *That God overrules the course of history for the accomplishment of his purpose is a major emphasis throughout the OT, but here it is shown how vitally the accomplishment of his purpose is bound up with the person and work of Christ. So, too, in Eph. 1:10 it is stated that God’s purpose, conceived by him in Christ before time began, to be put into effect when the appointed epoch had fully come, is that all things, in heaven and on earth, should be summed up in Christ. Or, as Paul had put*

> *it at an earlier date, it is by means of the mediatorial world-rule of Christ that God's eternal kingdom is finally to be established"* (Bruce 1984:65).

This is a lot of preamble to discuss one contextual use of hypotassō, but to attempt to tease out the implications—those oft, hard-to-detect associative semantics—requires immersion into an author's thought process and purposes for writing a text.

2.3.2 Colossians 3:18

> *Αἱ γυναῖκες, ὑποτάσσεσθε τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ὡς ἀνῆκεν ἐν κυρίῳ (UBS5)*
> *Wives, be subject to your husbands, as is fitting in the Lord (NASB)*

This use of hypotassō finds itself in a set of household codes (see Ephesians 5:21-24). I do not want to re-hash a previous section, but I do want to highlight a couple additional ideas looking at this context specifically.

At a glance, the verb, ὑποτάσσεσθε, is in present tense, imperative mood, and 2nd person. UBS5 identifies the verb as being in the middle voice, which should inform our understanding of the action inferred as being done against oneself. O'Brien presents "subordination" as his preferred gloss, which frees the context from the negative connotations of domination or forced submissiveness and servility, but also reinforces an idea of hierarchy (1982:221). Bruce reinforces this view, saying that even though "the principles of the new creation could be put into practice" and that in the church "women had equal status with men and slaves with free persons, just as Gentiles had with Jews" that in order to prevent the destabilization of society, the culturally-enforced and expected family hierarchy was "was left unaltered, apart from the introduction of the new principle, 'as is fitting in the Lord'" (1984:163). This statement represents the most commonly held interpretation of family codes in Colossians (and elsewhere), that even though Pauline "new creation" theology requires equality, unity, harmony, mutuality, humility, and love to permeate Christian social order (Fee 1999:43), these concepts were not to be understood as overturning, usurping, or dethroning mankind's established hierarchies. This argument seems so out-of-place in an epistle largely dedicated to correcting *against* syncretism and the adoption of man's hierarchies. Fee argues that one must take care when interpreting occasional or ad hoc instructions that one be very careful not to allow one's own hermeneutical agenda and personal history to guide interpretation, especially when there is exegetical ambiguity (1985:145-146).

In arguing against this ambiguity, Bratcher and Nida state that hypotassomai should be interpreted according to the "standards of the time" and means "to be subject to, obey, be

ruled by" and carries "implication of subordination, reflecting the standards of the time, which no amount of special pleading can banish" (1993:92–93). In this argument, an ancient definition of a word is used to determine the rhetoric context and thus find meaning in Col. 3:18—this seems surprising to me, because this goes against Nida's own rules and methodology for meaning arising from context. Additionally, to use the household codes, a time-bound, cultural relic, as the foundation for a theological position is an untenable hermeneutic approach (Marshall 2004:200-201). The theological should be foundational to one's interpretation—put simply, one should allow full context (literary, cultural, and theological) to inform one's understanding of words, not use an archaic definition of one term to set the context for everything else.

In the section leading to the household code in Colossians 3, the author exhorts his readers to "Set your mind on the things above, not on the things that are on earth" (v3:2) and continues, "Do not lie to one another, since you laid aside the old self with its evil practices, and have put on the new self who is being renewed to a true knowledge according to the image of the One who created him—a renewal in which there is no distinction between Greek and Jew, circumcised and uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave and freeman, but Christ is all, and in all" (v9-11). The author is ramping up, he is already preaching counter-culturally—the very point that those in Christ are radically, noticeably different in thought and deed. The passage continues,

> *So, as those who have been chosen of God, holy and beloved, put on a heart of compassion, kindness, humility, gentleness and patience; bearing with one another, and forgiving each other, whoever has a complaint against anyone; just as the Lord forgave you, so also should you. Beyond all these things put on love, which is the perfect bond of unity. Let the peace of Christ rule in your hearts, to which indeed you were called in one body; and be thankful. Let the word of Christ richly dwell within you, with all wisdom teaching and admonishing one another with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with thankfulness in your hearts to God. Whatever you do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks through Him to God the Father" (Col. 3:12-17 NASB)*

So, while many commentators note that there is no direct grammatical connection between v17 and v18—leading to the conclusion that the household codes are inserted as a unit, independent of rhetorical effect (Bratcher 1993:91)—one sees the phrases "whatever/in all you do" and "thankfulness to God" repeated throughout the household codes (v17, 20, 22,

23). I do not find at all that it requires "special pleading" to see the phrase *ὑποτάσσεσθε τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ὡς ἀνῆκεν ἐν κυρίῳ* as referring to something other than "being ruled by your husbands in the only fitting behaviour in the Lord"[14]. Marshall argues that in Colossians, the nature of "submission" (even using this as a gloss for hypotassō) is "not explained or dictated by the passage" as different times, cultures, and social relationships might find different behaviors associated with submission (2004:194). More importantly, based on the use of household codes, and our knowledge of Hellenistic Asia Minor, Marshall concludes that even though "Colossians is given in a situation where the wife was expected to be submissive to her husband" and that "the first line of Christian duty [lies] in doing what is expected within an existing setup" the force of the authorial intent in teaching is redefining the relationships to be fitting to the Lord—based in mutual love (2004:194-195).

Marshall's argument highlights the need to see some of the complexities in play in understanding hypotassō in this context. Connecting the teaching with the existing social order does remind converts that their behavior represents Christ, and it is not beneficial to the church to be subversive (to destroy peace). At the same time, relationships between Christians, ones who are renewed—different, are demarked by different behaviors; behaviors that prioritize compassion, kindness, humility, gentleness, and patience over asserting oneself. Hypotassō must be understood as something which sets up a relationship which allows both parties involved the freedom and ability to be united in Christ-like love.

In this context, we see much congruence with the Ephesians in associative and designative meanings:

1) Again, while authority can very much be in view of hypotassō, the authority of the one who orders things is more important than that of those being ordered. It does not seem congruent that the author would argue that allowing yourself to be ruled by men is the most fitting application of living as a new creation freed from former ways of life.
2) Hypotassō definitely refers to being set into a relationship with another, but that relationship being a hierarchy is not explicit.
3) The action of hypotassō is something that one can do for or against oneself.
4) In this context, the term is specifically used of husbands and wife, and not of slaves or children, and Marshall notes that in both the existent world culture and in context of the early church, the use of hypotassō in this context, in this epistle, in this

[14] While this statement is not made so explicit in translations, it is the conclusion of Bruce (NICNT), Pao (ZECNT) , O'Brien (WBC).

particular household code embedded with a command for husbands to love their wives (mirrored in Ephesians), that "something is silently happening to the nature of the [marriage] relationship" (2004:194). This context is the first step of NT marriage walking from patriarchy to mutual love, and there is no need to superimpose a militaristic, authoritarian interpretation on top of a passage with a very different focus: unity in love.

5) The verbal action of hypotassō creates a connection between two people—an association based on an ordered system. While the expected, required, or resultant behaviors and actions required by this association are not explicit, they most likely are concerned with humility, obedience, honor, respect, and gratitude.
6) Depending on one's interpretation of "as is fitting in the Lord", hypotassō either fulfills "fittingness" or can be done in a way that is "fitting". Being found in an imperative, in context of correcting behavior and countering a faulty worldview, it seems more likely to be the latter. It seems to fit into the author's argument better to say, "do hypotassō in a way that is fitting to the Lord" rather than "being hypotassō is fitting to the Lord". More clearly stated, the term hypotassō must refer to an action generic enough to be done positively or negatively, not simply an action that is always positive. So, glosses in line with "place yourselves", "be connected to", "allow yourself to be with", "allows yourself to be ordered with", seem to have more verisimilitude than "be ruled by", "submit to", or simply "obey".

The use of hypotassō in Colossians does not reveal a definitive semantic range, but it does help highlight some common pitfalls a modern translator or exegete needs to avoid. For instance, many modern translations put the household codes under a sub-heading, thus disconnecting the passages from their original hortative home. These codes then appear to be universe household rules, divorced from their originating exposition in a way that undermines their transformative nature. Very clearly, the author of Colossians was not writing to affirm the predominant worldview of Asia Minor as the preferable formative ideologies for the early church. It is right for a modern reader to first try to understand what was supposed to change for the original reader, and only then find seek a modern application.

2.4 Semantic analyses in Titus

There are three distinct contexts for hypotassō in the personal epistle Titus. While these contexts are, again, mostly used within household codes, there are a few distinctions worth

evaluating within the deutero-Pauline corpus. In discussing Pauline authorship, deSilva[15] states that the author of Titus "use[s] language that resonates more with Hellenistic religious terminology than we would expect if Paul wrote them, given the undisputed letters" (2004:741). In looking at Titus, one should also remember that Polycarp seemed to refer to the pastoral epistles, or at similar source texts, which place the texts in or very near the 1st century CE (deSilva 2004:746), and thus we look at the use of hypotassō in this epistle written in the time of the early church.

2.4.1 Issues related to designative and associative context in Titus

Several contextual issues need to be addressed which affect one's understanding of hypotassō within Titus. Firstly, the epistle, whether pseudonymous or not, is presented as a personal letter from Paul to Titus, not as a general or congregational letter. The general tone and argumentation within this epistle reflect an attitude of mentorship, instructing its recipient, Titus, to carry on with Paul's own vision "both to plant and to nurture" the local church; to not let these local congregations "simply [settle] down in the world and [make] peace with societal norms" but to "to see themselves, as caught up in the same end-time mission that was his own" (Laansma 2009:223). In the letter, Titus is said to be soon leaving Crete (v3:12), giving these instructions from apostolic authority to church leader a fervency. So, while the instructions are directed towards Titus, it is "needless to say that […] then the indirect form of the instruction for the churches which they oversee is inevitable" (Marshall & Towner 2004:145). So, while this letter is not generalized church polity, there are universal principles to be found which serve to instruct the Christ-following assembly found within the occasional instructions to a church leader, written to "ensure the healthy continuation of the church after [Titus'] departure" (M&T 2004:146).

While there is some doubt that Crete was the actual destination for Titus[16], Wieland proposes some interesting connections that have arisen from recent historical and archeological study. In evaluating specifically Cretan customs of the gender-divided instruction of young people, Crete's archeological association with Zeus and Isis, the ancient presence of Alexandrian Jews, and of NT hapax legomena being found on inscriptions on Crete, Wieland concludes that "readings that assume that the letter is interested only in the

[15] Though deSilva argues that the evidence for either side of Pauline authorship is inconclusive, there are valid points to the majority view of deutero-canonicity.
[16] Wieland references Houlden (1976), Dibelius & Conzelmann (1972), and Quinn (1990) as representing the majority view of uncertainty for a Cretan destination for the epistle.

internal ordering of the Christian community are insufficient" and that the epistle "is understood most satisfactorily as a product of early Christian mission and an intriguing example of creative missionary engagement with a specific environment" (Wieland 2009:353-354). This is an important consideration, as the household codes in Titus take on a different form than in the other deutero-Pauline epistles, and I will evaluate their use as both generic, ethical instruction in a Hellenistic setting, and as a solution to Cretan issues.

The exploration of social context for Titus happens to be a great place to briefly discuss the idea of "family values" and the early house church. Osiek talks about the tension created with the de-prioritization of family for the sake of the higher philosophy—in Hellenistic society, or God—saying,

> "At the same time when some Christian authors are advocating harmonious family life conformable to patriarchal hierarchy, others attribute to Jesus seeming rejection of basic family loyalties and allegiances. The question must have presented itself to the first Christian generations after Jesus: How were they to be family in the Lord? By being living examples of *pietas*, or by following the example of Jesus and defying societal expectations of domestic harmony? Both messages must have been coming at them simultaneously, and the Gospel allusions to the breaking up of families must be taken seriously as a reflection of what was happening to many." (Osiek 1996:9).

The questions posed by Osiek are deceptively complex. Before answering "how to be a family in the Lord" one would need to understand "what it means to be a family"—an answer to which is highly complicated in Hellenistic society. Citizens, freedwomen, and slaves might have different types of arrangements that looked like "marriage" but only a small percent had state-sanctioned contracts (Wordelman 1998:294). Not all men were *paterfamilias* and not all families were administered similarly (Osiek 1996:12-13), and not all sexual unions outside of marriage were adulterous (Wordelman 1998:392). There were different cultures, social statuses, laws, expectations, and while extant texts tell us much of Jewish life, academia has precious little description of what is was like to be a Christian family in the first and second centuries (Osiek 1996:9). All of this is simply to "bring an awareness that the mid-twentieth-century nuclear family is not normative, that the golden age of biblical families was not all it is cracked up to be, but that the family is a very strong social structure, strong precisely because it is so flexible" (Osiek 1996:24). As we look at hypotassō in Titus, it is important to remember that the author was much more familiar with the intricacies of life

in Crete (or more generally the Roman Empire) during the first century. When looking for universal principles and trying to understand the inferences of a word used, one has to be careful to avoid being too specific, as more general words tend to be more helpful when addressing a wide variety of readers. The author, knowing the diversity inherent to his audience, wrote truth that was to be instructive to all Christians--a group likely including both powerful man and slave-woman; wealthy converted household and isolated individual finding true family for the first time; Roman official and Jewish scholar. There was a distinct fear of cults and new religions that permeated Hellenistic society (Osiek 1996:23; Mounce 200:46), and the need for Christianity to not be seen as subversive cannot be overstated. Realizing this social setting, one sees that sometimes imperatives are not simply self-serving, but can direct one to serve a higher cause. "The imagination of the entire church and of all her members is to be captured by the mission of God. […] the center of this entire letter [is] the living out of God's grace toward humankind. Whatever is true with regard to social status of individual persons, no nobler role is possible for those bearing the image of God. (Laansma 2009:266).

2.4.2 Titus 2:5-9

ὑποτασσομένας τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν […] δούλους ἰδίοις δεσπόταις ὑποτάσσεσθαι ἐν πᾶσιν (UBS5)

being subject to their own husbands […] Urge bondslaves to be subject to their own masters in everything (NASB)

There are two uses of hypotassō within this set of household codes: one for young wives and one for slaves. The household codes here in Titus are organized slightly different than elsewhere in the NT, and only in this set are slaves and wives both told to *hypotassō*. What is perhaps most interesting in the Titus household codes is that the purpose of the instruction is more clearly stated—that in pursuing the codified behaviours "the word of God will not be dishonoured" (v5), that opponents "will have nothing bad to say about us" (v8), and that we might "decorate/adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in every respect" (v9). These *hina* statements help remove ambiguity in these semantic contexts, and also reveal the author's primary concern is the reputation of the truth of God being shared by the church.

The code addressing young wives is embedded in a direction to older women instructing them in how to rear younger women; this, embedded in a direction to Titus to teach things that are "fitting for sound doctrine" (v2:1). In evaluating this household code in more generic

terms, Laansma speaks of the “church as a household” which has to balance “conformity to norms of the surrounding society and those of God’s own household (being in but not of the world)” (2009:259). In violating these norms, young women might disgrace or shame the house of God, with Christ at its head, and “for a wife to fail to be submissive to her husband or to be unloving or impure, etc., would allow non-Christians to say that Christianity makes people worse rather than better and therefore that its message is not only useless but bad” (Knight 1992:309). In these household codes, one can see the author walking a line between the freedom and identity Christians have in Christ, and the missionary demands of church in taking some responsibility for its own survival and managing its witness.

Interestingly, Wieland connects the priestly language used in the direction given older women with ancient representations of young women performing priestly duties in Athena’s temple in Gortyn (on Crete) (2009:344). If Titus was written with Crete as its original destination, this passage could be an analogy that connects a woman’s work and attitude at home with their character in service to God. Furthermore, in a society which allows women’s service to a god to supersede (even temporarily) the nature of one’s interpersonal relationships it may be very appropriate to reinforce fidelity within Christian marriage. To this, Laansma, relying on Winter, discusses the likelihood of the Hellenistic emergence, on Crete, of a “new woman” characterized by sexual and social freedom. The language here may well show the author was “showing regard for Roman cultural norms in general, if he was not seeking actually to rein in specific maverick behaviour” (2009:265).

All of this is to say that the statement, ὑποτασσομένας τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν, serves many purposes in Titus 2:5. The author’s explicit intent is to instruct young women in ways to bring honour to the word of God. Taking into consideration the broad range of social situations possible, the word finds its most general applicability when understood as a term of connection or arrangement, rather than as an indicator of a specific behaviour.

When used of slaves, hypotassō is collocated with a series of negative qualifiers. The idea of a slave’s “subordination” is associated with being “well-pleasing” and *not* being “argumentative” nor “pilfering” (v9-10), all in an effort to adorn or decorate the doctrine of God (v10). Through these negative associations, one could say that hypotassō refers to one’s wilfulness, attitude, and faithfulness in a relationship. Put differently, simple obedience or capitulation does not necessarily fulfil the implied demand of hypotassō. Laansma, quoting Marshall, states, “that even the lowliest in society can contribute to the splendour of the Christian life.… [People] can live a Christian life within the existing orders of society; they are not displaying servility but rather recognising the will of the Creator within society and

seizing the opportunities for living to his glory." (2009:269)—as will be discussed later, to equip a slave with the potential to contribute is in-and-of itself empowering.

Discussing these contexts of hypotassō in Titus reveals the following qualifications for the term:

1) Hypotassō refers to accepting placement from God into the social structures of one's society.
2) Whether hypotassō is to be placed into a relationship (passive), or to place oneself (middle), it requires a selflessness and willingness.
3) Respecting the (possibly variant) conditions of "subordination" or "placement" is a matter of honour and faithfulness—put differently, willingly accepting hypotassō is exemplary behaviour, even if you consider yourself free from those conditions.
4) The attitudes one has, and the behaviour one engages in, when hypotassō-ing another not only serves the person with whom one is arranged, but more importantly, serves the system into which one is placed, and the administrator of said system.

In discussing the layers of submission mandated in NT household codes, Osiek comments "the family must look outward and be part of something greater than itself. Only then will it achieve its end of fostering the most basic qualities of faith, hope, and love. These are the family values worth striving for" (1996:24). In agreeance, it seems that hypotassō is used not to subjugate individuals, but rather instructs one towards a more Christ-like, missionary heart towards people that society, or they themself, perceive as "greater".

2.4.3 Titus 3:1

Ὑπομίμνῃσκε αὐτοὺς ἀρχαῖς ἐξουσίαις ὑποτάσσεσθαι, πειθαρχεῖν, πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἑτοίμους εἶναι (UBS5)
Remind them to be subject to rulers, to authorities, to be obedient, to be ready for every good deed (NASB)

This context is our first touchstone into civic submission, pulling our discussion out of family issues and into matters of state. Interesting in this verse is the command "remind them", as Titus is being instructed not to teach something new but reiterate something the recipients were already to know—maybe from a Pauline visit, maybe from a tradition. It is almost impossible to not automatically link this reminder to the authentically Pauline plea to Christians in Rome to "Πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἐξουσίαις ὑπερεχούσαις ὑποτασσέσθω" (Romans 13:1a, UBS5). As the topic of a Christian's civic duty is vast, a full diversion is beyond the scope

of this thesis; but as there is rhetorical, historical, textual, and narrative connection between the ideology of Romans 13 and this instruction for Christians to be reminded to be in subordination and obedience to the government, then I must at least provide a cursory summary.

First, however, there are two semantic items to develop:

1) Knight notes "we have a double asyndeton of two pairs, these two dative nouns and the two infinitives that follow them. It is most likely that the second infinitive, πειθαρχεῖν, is not to be taken by itself and therefore absolutely, but rather that it is to be taken with both of the nouns" (1992:332), and this assertion is supported by other commentators (Ibach & Blight 2003:Tt 3:1; Mounce 2000:443) and their arguments seem well-founded textually (Aland 2014:713). In this context, "to obey" is grammatically connected with hypotassō, making clear this semantic feature.
2) The good deeds mentioned in v1 are brought up again in v10, where the author says that those who believe in God should "be careful to engage in good deeds" as this is "good and profitable for men", and to avoid "foolish controversies", "disputes about the law", and "strife" which is unprofitable and worthless (v9). This section ends with an imperative to "reject a factious man" (v10) as "being self-condemned" he is "perverted and sinning" (v11). "Factious man" (NASB) is translated from the hapax legomena, αἱρετικός (hairetikos), defined in BDAG as "pertaining to causing divisions, factious, division-making" (2000). So, here, as in the household codes of the previous context, the command to hypotassō (and obey) is not self-contained nor self-serving. The primary concern is not that Christians submit to the governing authorities, but rather, that in "submitting" to authorities, Christians are prepared for and engage in good deeds that "have a point that goes well beyond staying under the speed limit, keeping a nice lawn, and paying the bills on time. The ambition is larger: the promotion of faith, love, and hope, justice, mercy, and faithfulness to whatever degree possible, always with a view to the expansion of the ultimate and perfect salvation and life that are in Christ" (Laansma 2009:281). Furthermore, if we unwind the passage starting from the imperative to "reject a division-maker", it follows logically that hypotassō is a part of a list of behavioural qualifiers which lead to the opposite of factions, sects, and divisions, which is unity—specifically unity in Christ as heirs of the hope of eternal life (v7). The nature of hypotassō in v1 must include a semantic qualification that does not allow the referent "subordination" or "subjection" to be complete or all-consuming. Said differently, the command inherent to this context is

> to pursue unity, to show the same mercy and grace Christ showed to mankind (v5-7), and the reminder to "subject oneself" is a method to pursue the command. While this may seem to be superfluous and pejoratively semantic, this point becomes important when someone in a position of power tries to use a passage like Tit. 3:1 to coerce behaviour or usurp God's own authority for themselves.

Now, turning again to the idea that "instructions on proper respect for human government was standard Christian teaching" (Laansma 2009:280) throughout the early church period, and here in Titus, the rhetorical context for this use of hypotassō is a reminder of something the Christians were already to have known. No attempt at even a summary exegesis of Romans 13 can neglect Moo's observation, quoted from Feinburg, that "it is only a slight exaggeration to say that the history of the interpretation of Rom. 13:1-7 is the history of attempts to avoid what seems to be its plain meaning" (1999:97)—the plain meaning being "you must submit to your government". However, Westfall posits that "the Pauline corpus has historically been incorrectly interpreted as positively supporting the hierarchy and power of the imperial government" even though Jesus (Matt. 20:25) and Paul (1 Cor 1:18-21) both reject it (2016:243-244). There is a vast spectrum of how "submission to government" has been interpreted--ranging from the Nazi state's justification of divine purpose in genocide (Olree 2005:192) to accepting [this] teaching as pure sarcasm (Carter in Christoyannopoulos 2011:253). Olree argues—reminding his readers that a pagan state religion, established cultism, prostitution and abortion, idolatry, homosexuality, slavery, and ethnic persecution were all aspects of Roman rule—that Paul was not putting a universal stamp of approval on everything any government authority might ever do (2005:196). There is a limit to the authority God has extended to governments, and they should be focussed on preventing the harm people do one another, and "when human government exceeds these bounds, it is no longer acting within the scope of the agency authorized by God (Olree 2005:197). Feinberg argues that "When the state demands what conscience will not condone, by biblical standards, then Christians must disobey. Balance is needed. We should not empty the meaning of Romans 13:1-7 with a thousand qualifications. Civil rulers need the support of Christians under their authority. But the state can never have the place that must be reserved for God alone" (1999:99).

When considering the cultural context of the early church presented in the Pastoral epistles, a clear apostolic imperative arises that Christianity not become labelled as dissident or revolutionary. Whether this voice is commanding submission or recognizing the church as being in a subjected position, it is clearly telling early Christians to avoid "doing resistance,

anger, assault, power play, or anything contrary to loving the enemy" (Christoyannopoulos 2011:255). If one uses Romans 13 as a model for a Pauline stance of civic duty, the simplest meaning is clear, God did establish government, and it is His agent of both good and wrath—however, even when the government errs, and even in the face of persecution, a Christian is required to love their enemy. Christoyannopoulos, quoting Ballou, asserts that a "Christian has nothing to care for but be a Christian indeed" (2011:264), and that submission to a government is a derivative of submission to God. As such, Christian action, even subjected to a government, should be defined by love—and even though one is called to willingly place themself under potentially evil governments, one must keep from acting in kind, and retaliating; and rather, set a Christ-like "example of humility and peaceful living for others" (Christoyannopoulos 2011:261).

There are further considerations for finding associative meaning in this context. Mounce characterizes Titus as having "anti-emperor" rhetoric in describing Jesus Christ as the true God and saviour (2000:444), inferring that the reminder to submit to and obey the government was given to prevent Christians from ignoring or rebelling against civil authorities. Additionally, this passage's plea to civic obedience may have been given in "light of the stereotyped rebellious character of the Cretans. Quinn cites Polybius as saying that it was almost 'impossible to find … personal conduct more treacherous or public policy more unjust than in Crete'" (Mounce 2000:444). One cannot definitively determine if, in instructing subjection and obedience to the governing authorities, the author was: preventing Christians from Cretan unruliness; encouraging piety in the face of an evil government; or correcting wayward Jewish teachers; but woven throughout this passage is a clear theme of true humility. Laansma reminds us that the "notion of showing humility has a definite history within the biblical story […] classically used of Moses (Num. 12:3, LXX) and especially of Jesus (Matt 11:29–30), as well as of Paul (2 Cor 10:1)" (2009:281). Having been shown humble kindness themselves, Christians should be the "last ones showing contempt for their pagan neighbors and the first to be 'shedding [it] abroad'" (Laansma 2009:281).

In this context, hypotassō clearly refers to an attitude of at least some subordination towards governing authorities. What I find interesting, however, is that the subordinates are not described as inferior, less-than, and they are not subordinate on account of some notion that "they deserve to be". As heirs of God Himself, the Christians are to be exemplars of Christ, putting aside self-interest in order to pursue unity by bringing outsiders into the fold,

and casting out dissident voices. Here, hypotassō takes on some of the following semantic features:

1) Refers to a humble attitude taken towards someone which leads to unity and harmony in the relationship.
2) Obedience can be the prime directive of hypotassō.
3) Hypotassō does not require that one see the person they are placed with as better, more moral, as having more authority, or even having control over oneself.
4) Hypotassō seems to refer more to a genuine conciliatory attitude more than subservience, servility, or subjection (in a negative sense).

Even though hypotassō can be used to describe a domineering relationship with one's government, the stated purpose for hypotassō in Titus 3, and the consistent attribution of true authority to God, do more than hint that hypotassō should not be understood simply as "giving in to" or even as "compromising" oneself—rather, it is a means to help another experience God's kindness, mercy, and forgiveness through one's humility and selflessness. Pulling all these implications together, Spicq possibly said it best, understanding hypotassō as "spontaneously [positioning] oneself as a servant toward one's neighbor in the hierarchy of love" (1994:424-426).

Chapter 3: Hypotassō in the catholic letters

> *By following the Christian way of life, disciples are held to attain to the highest ethical ideals of Greco-Roman philosophy. As this becomes more and more clearly manifest to outsiders, the virtue of Christians should provide one more reason that outsiders should hold the group in high regard rather than slander the Way. (deSilva 2004:751)*

3.1 Evaluating the catholic letters as a corpus

"The earliest known occurrence of the adjective "catholic" referring to a letter is in the account of an anti-Montanist, Apollonius (c. 197) in his rebuke of a Montanist writer who 'dared, in imitation of the Apostle [probably John] to compose a catholic epistle' for general instruction" (Rylaarsdam & Davis 2018). The seven catholic ("universal" or "general") epistles were likely gathered together into sub-corpora and subsequently brought together throughout the 2nd and 3rd centuries, and "by the time of the fourth century, the existence of the Catholic Epistles as a group—with James at the head, followed by 1 Peter, 2 Peter, and Jude (in that order, though separated by the Johannine Epistles)—is well established" (Porter 2013:124). There is an on-going academic discussion regarding the preferred hermeneutical approach one takes with these epistles, as their organization as a corpus affects their reception, and evaluating these letters together seems to divorce them from their individual historic settings. In surveying scholarship on these epistles, Lockett concludes that one need "read taking both their individual historical situations and their literary and theological placement within the New Testament as crucial for their correct interpretation" (2015:80).

I find it plausible enough that just as there was a "parcelling out of the world" in the missionary efforts described in Acts (Michaels 1988:xlvii), there was a need to gather apostolic voices from a very early point in church history. Additionally, that authors knew their work would be gathered and shared is attested in the texts themselves and the history of transmission (Porter 2013:76-79); and an authentic Pauline letter calls James, Peter, and John "pillars" of the burgeoning belief system (Gal. 2:7-9). There was immense value put on the collective apostolic voice from Jerusalem, and I think it is not a jump at all to evaluate these letters, though written to different recipients, and even possibly pseudonymously, as texts united in spirit and authority, and later, as canon.

3.1.1 Classifying the contexts of hypotassō

The following is a list of all the direct contexts using the lemma hypotassō in the catholic letters. The forms of hypotassō are left untranslated to help classify the senses according to contrasts.

Table 3-1

ID	Reference	Koiné Text / Partial Translation
1	James 4:7	**ὑποτάγητε** οὖν τῷ θεῷ therefore **ὑποτάγητε** to god
2	1 Peter 2:13	Ὑ**ποτάγητε** πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει διὰ τὸν κύριον, Ὑ**ποτάγητε** to every human institution for the Lord's sake
3	1 Peter 2:18	Οἱ οἰκέται **ὑποτασσόμενοι** ἐν παντὶ φόβῳ τοῖς δεσπόταις [the] slaves, **ὑποτασσόμενοι** in every respect to masters
4	1 Peter 3:1	Ὁμοίως αἱ γυναῖκες, **ὑποτασσόμεναι** τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν, Likewise, [the] wives, **ὑποτασσόμεναι** to your own husbands
5	1 Peter 3:5	**ὑποτασσόμεναι** τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν, **ὑποτασσόμεναι** to their own husbands
6	1 Peter 3:22	**ὑποταγέντων** αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων **ὑποταγέντων** to him angels and authorities and powers
7	1 Peter 5:5	Ὁμοίως, νεώτεροι, **ὑποτάγητε** πρεσβυτέροις Likewise, young[er] ones, **ὑποτάγητε** to elders

A few semantic and grammatical contrasts can be observed with a cursory evaluation of these contexts: In the catholic letters, hypotassō is mainly used imperatively, as all these contexts are direct instruction, or a part of household code; the exception being context 6, which is an LXX citation. The action being commanded is executed against individuals and the dative recipient of the object acted against can be god (1), organizations (2, 6), or individuals (3, 4, 5, 7). The participial uses of hypotassō are in the present tense with the exception of 6, with the middle/passive marker, -μεν-, present; leaving context as the primary indicator as to verbal voice—or, is the participle reflexive or passive. The common passive imperatival use should remind the reader that "both solemnity and a heightened urgency are its force" (Wallace 196:720). In speaking to the aspectual nature of NT Greek, McKay states, "in most NT contexts in which participles are associated with imperatives there can be little doubt that they represent paratactic imperatives" (McKay 1985:225). As the majority of contexts are participial in nature, and since participles only add voice and aspect into understand the root verb, one is left to find grammatical significance in "from its context, and in some contexts there is a certain amount of ambiguity" (McKay 1985:224).

So, in the catholic letters, hypotassō is used to refer to direct individuals enter into, or allow themselves to be put into, various types of social (2, 3, 4, 5, 7), spiritual (1, 6), or authoritarian (2, 6) relationships. The exact nature of the implied relationship does not seem to be inherent to hypotassō, as this significance is found in the nouns used—for example: husbands and wives are in a marriage—a culturally understood institution. The fact that hypotassō is used to describe relationships between humans and god; Jesus Christ and angels/authorities/powers; husbands and wives; older and younger individuals; people and governance; and slaves and masters, hints that hypotassō should be understood more generally, as opposed to verbs where the nature of the action is more explicit. For instance, a modern reader may infer that sexual submission, a common association of submission in the marriage context, carries over into the imperative for young ones to submit to older. Forcing hypotassō into the semantics of only one type of relationship undermines the flexibility and primary sense of the word.

Generally, speaking, the action of hypotassō is given as a command to be followed, and is used in conjunction with other commands—the expected action of hypotassō either is in causal or dependent relationship with the other commands given in context. So, the most inclusive and general classifications for understanding hypotassō in the catholic letters become:

Table 3-2

ID	Sense
A	Placing oneself, or allowing oneself to be placed, into a relationship with another human being and agreeing to act honorably and respectfully to the terms of said relationship—the nature of the relationship is determined by other factors.
B	To be put into a systematized relationship with a spiritual or legal authority

3.1.2 The uses of lexemes related to hypotassō

As in the deutero-Pauline corpus, I will discuss some points arising from a brief paradigmatic analyzation of the catholic letters to help develop the core and crucial features of hypotassō—the discussion of each direct context will follow.

Table 3-3

Lemma	Simple Sense
τιμάω	to honour
ἐγγίζω	draw near

ταπεινόω	to be humble
ὑπερήφανος	the proud
ταπεινόφρων	humility
ἀγαθοποιέω	to do right, to do what is good
ἁγνός	pure, holy
φόβος	to respect, to fear
πραΰς	gentle
ἡσύχιος	quiet

3.1.2.1 Nearness not necessarily under-ness

When one places context 1 into its rhetorical context, James 4:5-10, there is an interesting collocation of words of placement with hypotassō: ἐγγίζω (draw near; approach [BDAG]), φεύγω (flee [BDAG]), and then the dynamics of moving from ταπεινόω (humble [BDAG]) to ὑψόω (exalt [BDAG]). Though I will look closer at the "catena of imperatival calls and their consequences [set] under the rubric of submission" (Martin 1988:142) in more detail; for now, it is important to note that the first couplet of instructions in this rubric is to resist the devil, causing him to *move distant from you* (v7); and to *draw closer to God* that He might Himself *draw closer to you* (v8). The semantic force of hypotassō seems to be accepting the rules of engagement in a new relationship or taking on a predetermined alignment for your behaviours. Interestingly, here the statement is made that as one draws close to the person to whom they've aligned—God—He draws closer as well. These terms of movement and distance seem to support an understanding of hypotassō in terms of contracts and assignment more than position within a hierarchy. Hypotassō denotes a relationship that can have mutual, bilateral movement, not just a stative existence in a hierarchy.

Looking closer at ἐγγίζω, it is used elsewhere in the catholic letters exclusively to temporal closeness: of the Parousia in James, and "the end of all things" in 1 Peter. In the Septuagint, this is a term used in context of worshipping God, approaching the altar, or coming near to God Himself (Osborne 2011:89). These apocalyptic and covenantal themes strongly associate the ideology of hypotassō with the Jewish worldview, so much that one could say that command to hypotassō is a "prophetic admonition that is closely parallel to the Old Testament appeal to Israel to return to Yahweh, the covenant God from whom they have strayed" (Martin 1988:156). The wilful action of placing oneself in alignment with God increases our closeness to him spiritually, temporally, relationally, covenant-ly, and opens

the door for the “gracious and forgiving God [to accept] our contrite spirit and in turn [cast] his loving presence upon us” (Osborne 2011:90).

3.1.2.2 God is opposed to the proud and gives grace to the humble

Deeply engrained in the instructions to hypotassō, the household codes, and parenetic summaries in the catholic letters is the theme of humility. I cannot afford the space for a digression into a full discussion on humility, but there is emphatic rhetorical and semantic connection between hypotassō contexts in both James and 1 Peter. Both authors use the Scriptural quote “God is opposed to the proud, but gives grace to the humble” (James 4:6, 1 Peter 5:5/quoted from LXX Proverbs 3:34) as the foundation for their imperatival use of hypotassō, and the “grace given to the humble” is purported as a prime motivation for “doing good” as a follower of Jesus Christ.

For our purposes, it is noteworthy that the varied language of humility is interspersed throughout the directives to hypotassō (ID’s below from Table 3-1):

Table 3-4

ID	Reference	Context / Related humility terminology
1	James 4:7	**ὑποτάγητε** οὖν τῷ θεῷ The five imperatives used to define submission are sandwiched between, “God is opposed to the proud, but gives grace to the humble” (Prov. 3:34) and “Humble yourselves in the presence of the Lord, and He will exalt you” (Job 5:11)
2	1 Peter 2:13	Ὑ**ποτάγητε** πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει διὰ τὸν κύριον This directive is syntactically paired with, “Act as free men, and do not use your freedom as a covering for evil, but use it as bondslaves of God” (v16)—making oneself as δοῦλος of God, one can, through good deeds, silence foolish men (v15).
3	1 Peter 2:18	Οἱ οἰκέται **ὑποτασσόμενοι** ἐν παντὶ φόβῳ τοῖς δεσπόταις Slaves are to act in φόβος, even with unruly masters, as endurance in unjust suffering finds favour with God (v19-20).
4,5	1 Peter 3:1-5	Ὁμοίως αἱ γυναῖκες, **ὑποτασσόμεναι** τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν In **ὑποτασσόμεναι** to husbands, wives take on the following attributes which are emulated from righteous women of old (v5): ἁγνός (pure), φόβος (respectful), πραΰς (humility/gentleness), and ἡσύχιος (quiet/well-ordered).
7	1 Peter 5:5	Ὁμοίως, νεώτεροι, **ὑποτάγητε** πρεσβυτέροις

	This command to "younger ones" is given after instructing "elders" to exercise voluntary, non-compulsory, oversight, and is followed by, "and all of you, clothe yourselves with humility toward one another, for GOD IS OPPOSED TO THE PROUD, BUT GIVES GRACE TO THE HUMBLE" (v5)

While one cannot directly equate tapeinoō with hypotassō, there is clearly an intrinsic and close paradigmatic relationship between the two. Whereas modern readers might see obedience as the implementation of submission, and some type of ontological or social hierarchy as its basis, the catholic letters present a subtlety. Here, submission is a means of obedience, with humility as the goal, and subsequent closeness to and exaltation from God.

After comparing James' wisdom statements to various ancient sources, Lappenga concluded that,

> *"James is a Hellenistic document, to be sure, but comparison with early Jewish wisdom literature shows the profoundly sapiential nature of the letter. […] [highlighting] for his readers the way that misdirected zeal manifests itself in the neglect of the needy, distorted friendship, and emulation of the ways of evil/violent people" (Lappenga 2017:1006).*

This wisdom-based argument against pride and "distorted" human friendships is based on a variety of Jewish traditions (Michaels 1988:293), and the correlation of pride, humility, and submission is also found in Jesus teaching, the very same proverbial quote found in his admonishing the Pharisees (Matthew 23:1-12), the Parable of the Guests (Luke 14:7-11), and the Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican (Luke 18:9-14). Famously, Jesus performed the work of a slave, washing his disciples' feet at the so-called Last Supper, instructing them, "For I gave you an example that you also should do as I did to you. Truly, truly, I say to you, a slave is not greater than his master, nor is one who is sent greater than the one who sent him. If you know these things, you are blessed if you do them" (John 13:15-17 NASB). The idea that emulating Jesus in Christ-like leadership includes a turning upside-down of the social expectations of rulership, enacted by God, is well-established in Jewish and early Christian ideology.

This tradition and well-attested connection of submission as the implementation of obedience to God allows one to find some associative meaning for hypotassō. Michaels concludes that though direct literary dependency cannot be established, the "main point of

similarity between Peter and James is the close association between humble submission to God and successful resistance to the devil" (1988:294). Considering the collocation of humility terms used to differentiate Christians from hedonists, we can safely consider pride, arrogance, and disorderly conduct as antonyms to hypotassō. This adds to our understanding that hypotassō is not always used to refer to actions that are demanded by hierarchical or ontological concerns; nor must one interpret hypotassō from a perspective of being subjugated. In the catholic letters, hypotassō is presented as means to attain the humility which brings about exaltation from God.

3.1.2.3 The context of honor

> *"Honor is an idea which binds a society together in a common culture – a shared constellation of values and commitment to those values. Because honor is granted by one's society, and because one desires honor, one will act in accordance with the norms and values of one's society, and often subordinate one's own interests to the interests of the larger society" (deSilva 2008:84).*

The language of hypotassō is deeply associated with the language of honor in the catholic letters. The heavy use of hypotassō in explanations of household codes shows this relationship, as DeSilva explains that marriage and family structure are primarily supported through sanctions of dishonour (deSilva 2008:84). Additionally, several of the direct contexts using hypotassō are set in line with commands to τιμάω (honor, revere [BDAG]) others; with a goal of χάρις (grace, favour, goodwill [BDAG]); and in context of God being established as a patron-Father—all of these collocations and associations identify honor as being in view. Finally, one might note the contribution of the Wisdom texts used as the basis for the directives to hypotassō; deSilva argues, Jewish wisdom texts, including Proverbs, "[use] honor in many of the same ways as did Aristotle of Pseudo-Isocrates, promoting the behaviours and virtues central to the dominant culture of Israel" (2008:75). This, in turn highlights another aspect of associative meaning for a Jewish-Hellenistic audience, that,

> *"honor comes from obedience to the law and conducting oneself in the fear of God. A correction or reproof calculated to bring one into closer conformity with the law becomes an opportunity for honor, which is preserved not in despising instruction through launching a riposte but rather in embracing the reproof and amending one's walk" (deSilva 2008:81).*

This idea of taking on behaviours—which are sometimes counter-cultural or at least counter-expectational—in reverence of God is also heavily featured in contexts with hypotassō, as is the implied response for the recipients to change their own behaviour in order to emulate Christ and disprove oppositional voices.

Now, these honor-words are not necessarily cast against hypotassō in a such a way where one can discuss direct paradigmatic relationships, but the rhetorical and ideological context of hypotassō is the complex, varied, and competitive constellation of honor held by the epistles' original recipients. In synthesizing texts about honor from ancient Greek, Hellenistic, and Jewish literature, deSilva argues,

> *"In order to survive in a situation of cultural pluralism, minority cultures developed alternate arenas for the fulfilling of their member's desire for honor, their φιλοτιμία. Honor is now defined in terms of the minority culture's traditions and values; those who do not share these definitions are set aside as shameless, or as errant. The negative opinion which such people might have of the group and its members carries no weight because it rests on error, and the representative of the minority culture can look forward to his or her vindication when the extend of that error is revealed." (deSilva 2008:154).*

The survival-response described by deSilva can be seen throughout the catholic letters and in context with hypotassō.

This theme of honor will be highlighted as I look at each context in turn, but at this point, I want to highlight two contextual topics that need to be kept in mind when interpreting hypotassō in the catholic letters:

1) Christ is to be the exemplar for all Christian behavior. Sometimes, Christians are called to honor the less-honorable or the undeserving. Sometimes, Christians are expected to endure hardship and oppression—even suffering. Sometimes, Christians must serve the harsh, unruly, and disobedient. Between the hypotassō directives to slaves and wives in 1 Peter 2 is written, *"For you have been called for this purpose, since Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example for you to follow in His steps, who committed no sin, nor was any deceit found in his mouth; and while being reviled, He did not revile in return; while suffering, He uttered no threats, but kept entrusting Himself to Him who judges righteously; and He Himself bore our sins in His body on the cross, so that we might die to sin and live to righteousness;*

for by His wounds you were healed" (1 Peter 2:21-24 NASB). The example is this: suffering, reviled, and serving the unworthy, Jesus Christ humbled himself, even submitted himself, to the dishonor and shame of the cross; but all was done while *entrusting* himself to His Father God, knowing that in seeming dishonor, grace in the form of a promised resurrection would come.

2) Interspersed throughout the letters are also the pleas and commands for φιλοτιμία predicted by deSilva. Between the commands to hypotassō "to all human institution" and "slaves to masters", is the proverbial, "Honor all people, love the brotherhood, fear God, honor the king" (1 Peter 2:17). Preceding the imperative to hypotassō to God is the statement, "Do not speak against one another, brethren. He who speaks against a brother or judges his brother, speaks against the law and judges the law" (James 4:11). Though there are others, this call to brotherhood may find its clearest enunciation when the author of 1 Peter concludes the household codes, saying, *"To sum up, all of you be harmonious, sympathetic, brotherly, kindhearted, and humble in spirit; not returning evil for evil or insult for insult, but giving a blessing instead; for you were called for the very purpose that you might inherit a blessing"* (1 Peter 3:8-9). Many commentators find brotherly love to be the central theme of the household codes in Peter; Osborne, relying on Davids and Elliott, describes a "chiasm in the five characteristics (given in Hellenistic style with rarely used terms) of a Christian community in 3:8: how one thinks (like-minded, humble), how one feels (sympathetic, tenderhearted)" concluding that "all these are part of an attitude of general subordination of Christians to one another" (2011:215).

While the debates over the Hellenistic-Jewish understanding of honour continues, we find that hypotassō is firmly placed within honour-bound wisdom, ethical, and social parenetic in the catholic letters. One must at least consider a recipient's conception of and status within an honour system to understand the words used to describe and extol honourable action, good deeds, reciprocity, and grace. At a minimum, in the catholic letters' use of hypotassō we find a synthesis of Jewish teachings which are becoming a "Christian ethic of enemy-love" that includes "opting out of concerns for preserving one's own status and reputation in society and refusing to participate in the give-and-take of challenge-riposte that helped to define conventional social relations" (Green 2007:105). The repeated instructions to embrace brotherhood, act in a way to bring about peaceful relationships, look past the wrongs of others, to consider the honour of others, and to, even in relationships defined by suffering, *hypotassō* to others, seem to shift the understanding of the term from a stative

concept of being subordinate, submissive, or obedient towards more active ideas like: engaging in solidarity; upholding; supporting; or even favouring another within a covenant.

3.2 Semantic analysis in James

There is no doubt that the interpretation of James is a complex task. For this thesis, we only must look at the semantics of one word, *hypotassō,* but even this task is complicated by the presence of chiasm, apocalyptic and prophetic reference, LXX reliance, and layers of imperatival links—all of this makes finding one locus for interpretation impossible. It seems a disservice to discount the term as simply finding meaning from its ancient etymology, and the entire epistle is famous for its pragmatic sapience, with a "higher percentage of ethical commands […] than in any other New Testament book" (Osborne 2011:3). So, ostensibly, James might seem easy-to-understand; the inherent ambiguity of wisdom literature, and the broad applicability of metaphoric speech can lure a reader too far from exegesis and into the pseudo-knowledge of eisegesis.

3.2.1 Issues related to designative and associative context in James

Determining authorship and audience can be vital in studying semantics, and the authorship, audience, form, date, and canonicity of James has perplexed scholars in Christianity since its earliest days. This said, after a lengthy discussion on the identity of James and the likely situation behind the creation of his epistle, Martin concludes, "what may be affirmed with some confidence is that in publishing this letter under the aegis of James the Lord's brother […] set in motion a train of events that led to a veneration of the master as both model teacher and heroic martyr" (1988:48). While the character, quality, and language of the parenetic "miscellany"[17] in James has caused much consternation, there is currently an increasing realization that the epistle is "an artfully constructed series of ethical exhortations that fit together very well into a united discourse" (Osborne 2011:9).

The later views which seem to put James's epistle at odds with Paul via "faith vs. works", or James' later associations with Gnosticism or heretical "Jewish Christians", are also being found lacking, Osborne, relying on Johnson's conclusions, argues that the just and righteous teacher known as James was never identified as an opponent to Paul, nor did he sponsor any ritual excluded from Christianity (including circumcision); there is more that connects

[17] The view of James as a collection of mini-homilies represented by Dibellius (1975).

James and Paul in teaching than disconnects, and both "were thoroughly Jewish in their background and ideas, but the difference is that James always ministered in a Jewish setting while Paul became the apostle to the Gentiles" (Osborne 2011:5). There is a difference in the locale for origination and the social situation of the expected audience between the two, but both were part of a greater, unified, authoritative voice.

What is interesting in the epistle of James is the density of LXX usage and a tone that seems right out of the minor prophets. Viewing the letter as a "diaspora letter", Bowden characterizes James as "including (1) the discourse being clothed in the form of prophetic oracle, and (2) the distinct expectation of repentance and restoration" (2015:94). The ethical propositions in James are heavily influenced by the message of the Twelve, especially Hosea, Amos, and Malachi, additionally, it is "well-recognized that James echoes much of Jesus' teaching from the synoptic tradition" (Jobes 2009:141-142); effectively, the author of James, like Jesus, "does not abolish the Law of the Sinai covenant but underscores its extend and demand for internal transformation" (Jobes 2009:141). Martin, evaluating the dual-themes of wisdom and the "righteous sufferer" concludes,

> *"The implicit teaching and exhortation is that the righteous (usually a poor, law-abiding, Torah-keeping minority) must expect to suffer in this world at the hands of overlords and oppressors, characterized as sinners, unjust, godless, etc. The prevailing disposition is to be one of patient endurance and fortitude with the hope that in the end Yahweh will redress their lot and rescue them. There will be a reversal of roles in that day, as the ungodly are judged and punished, while the righteous are established and promoted" (Martin 1988:xcvii)*

If not actually writing from Jerusalem, the author of James is writing from its authority in Christianity's genesis, relying on Jewish wisdom, using her prophetic voice to reinforce Jesus Christ's teachings, in unity with Paul's message to the gentiles, that in view of the coming end, the Christian life is still "comprised of the moral and ethical obligations that God has always expected of his people" (Jobes 2009:142). With this mindset, we can appropriately look at understanding *hypotassō* with its original intent in James 4.

3.2.2 James 4:7

ὑποτάγητε οὖν τῷ θεῷ (UBS5)
Submit therefore to God (NASB)

While the command ὑποτάγητε οὖν τῷ θεῷ is not a direct citation, this command is given as the way to achieve the grace promised by God through the prophets. The author's expectations for what it means to *hypotassō* is explained through the use of direct quotes from Proverbs (Prov. 3:34 LXX, 14:13), Malachi (Mal. 3:7), Zechariah (Zech. 1:3), Job (17:9), Jeremiah (Jer. 4:14) and Nehemiah. In verse 10, the idea is summarized, in what might be a direct reference from Job 5:10, as "Humble yourselves in the presence of the Lord, and He will exalt you" (Jas 4:10). James' foundational explanation of *hypotassō* is deeply rooted in Jewish wisdom and apocalyptic expectation, and one cannot ignore the influence and implications of these syntactic and grammatic connections.

If one allows the LXX as a potential source text, Osborne notes a "wordplay" (2011:89) found between the Proverbial quote "κ̅ς̅ ὑπερηφανοις αντιτασσεται" (IGNTP 2012) and "ὑποτάγητε οὖν τῷ θεῷ" (Jas 4:7)[18], which creates an interesting platform for discussion thinking through hypotassō. If the author is appending *hypotassō* to a proverb (through the use of *syn*), which uses antitassō in an antonymic wordplay (possibly even chiastic structure centred on God's giving grace to the humble); then hypotassō denotes *doing the opposite of what God opposes* (which in this context is self-aggrandizement/pride), with a result of being gifted χάρις (grace). Now, it is worth mentioning that χάρις is "almost a technical term in the reciprocity-oriented world dominated by Hellenic influence as well as by the Semitic sense of social obligation expressed in the term חֶסֶד" (Danker, Bauer, & Gingrich 200:1079); and חֶסֶד is defined as "joint obligation between relatives, friends, host and guest, master and servant; closeness, solidarity, loyalty" (HALOT 2000). Additionally, the terms for "proud" and "humble" are common words in reference to the public perception of one's social standing. The interesting facets of associative meaning that arise in this discussion are the nature of the arrangement and connectedness implied by hypotassō. The primary force of the verb is understood against the demands and colloquial understanding of a complex honour-based social situation—the action of ὑποτάγητε οὖν τῷ θεῷ seems to imply a two-way relationship, not simply accepting of God's authority or taking up a lesser position "under" Him. In this context, *to submit* is connected with an attitude of solidarity, togetherness, and a harmony and unity in demeanour and action which lead to the reversal

[18] Osborne does argue from a place of defining hypotassō as "placed under" which affects the commentary, focusing it on authority.

of fortune for a person living in oppression and persecution. If you are oppressed, you would want to know the best way to garner God's favour—hypotassō is about wilfully acting in accord with the will of a potentially benevolent patron, and is not necessarily the result of a greater power or authority exerting its influence. Yes, subordination and submission are essential parts of this social milieu, but here in James, we find an exhortation to act in the paradoxical ideology of making oneself less, so that God will exalt you. Martin summarizes this, saying,

> *"The point is that humility before God is the only way to true joy. Humility—that state of total dependence on God—is foreign to "the world." To seek to be exalted by the world is dangerous, as well as futile (see 1:9–11). But to humble oneself before God is to await his eschatological reversal and to look to him for his intervention (Luke 14:11). Such is the way of the Christian life for the author, who is consciously adopting a stance of the Jewish apocalyptists in their time of trial." (Martin 1988:155)*

Osborne describes this connection of humility and submission in three points, "the main thrust is that one can only find victory over Satan by relying entirely on God. The second develops the meaning of repentance as the path that submission must follow, a deep remorse and sorrow for sin. The third repeats the central point—submission to God is the only means by which a Christian can find exaltation" (2011:89). He also connects this teaching with the Lord's prayer from the Gospel of Matthew, "Two aspects […] apply (Matt 6:9–10)—"May your name be kept holy," an absolute concern that the sacredness of the name of God be magnified in our life; and "May your will be done," an acquiescence to God's will in everything we say and do" (2011:89). Hypotassō is characterized by an attitude wherein one repents of self-reliance and self-aggrandizement, and seeks the provision, salvation, and direction found in pursuing someone else's will (in this case, God's).

This explanation of submission to God, is summarized in verse 10, "Humble yourselves in the presence of the Lord, and He will exalt you". The author's use of tapeinos (v6,10), and the inclusion of the "double-minded" (introduced in James 1:8), creates an implicit context "with the pious poor (the Anawim) tradition" in Jewish thought and the community described in James 1 (McKnight 2011:344). McKnight finds the language used in James 1 to be "sharp and biting, even ironical or sarcastic" (2011:104), clearly in-line with prophetic tradition. Regardless if one interprets the rich to be messianic brother or not, the author "knows full well the power of the rich, and he finds the rich to be those who blaspheme the name of the Messiah and abuse their power over the poor messianic Jewish community." (McKnight

2011:104). However, there is a paradox revealed in James 1, one that is repeated in context with hypotassō; namely, even though the poor are socially low, and even though there are powerful and rich individuals demanding submission and obedience, and even though blessing and economic abundance have seemingly been attained by the rich/prideful, "for the messianic community, what the rich are doing in an unjust manner is designed (by God?) to be an opportunity to trust in God for moral formation. In other words, […] their economic persecution, met by endurance, will paradoxically earn them a 'crown of glory'" (McKnight 2011:104). Again, it seems that "submission" to God incorporates a large range of implications, focussed on an individual's willingness to rely on another.

In James 4:7, hypotassō carries the following semantic features:

1) Voluntarily taking on an attitude of humility towards another to whom you are connected in a social arrangement; this attitude starts internally with repentance, prayer, and worship allowing one to "draw nearer" to the other, and results in "[showing] him respect and obedience" (Kistemaker in Osborne 2011: 89).
2) Includes an aspect of trusting in another to provide and even to save you; this is from the perspective of someone who already sees themselves as oppressed, which gives hypotassō the subtle feature of "active reliance" rather than "passive allowance".
3) Entering in a social agreement with another, with a wilful acknowledgement and intent to act in a way which honours the other.
4) Joining a brotherhood or fellowship with others who are all acting together in harmony to perform the will of the "head" of the community; as a community upholding the values and obeying the commandments of the head, who from an honour-reciprocity worldview, is active in sustaining and ultimately saving the community.

In the messianic brotherhood described in James, McKnight finds that,

> *"God has himself chosen to create a community that testifies to his eschatological redemption now at work. Thus, there is an ontology or an ontic presence of God at work in the community that can evidently unleash the power for the messianic community to trust God's goodness and to live above and through the stresses they are experiencing at the hands of the rich." (McKnight 2011:132)*

If this characterization is true, then James paints hypotassō in a very hopeful light. Through this action, one puts aside their own will and identity, and allows themselves to be arranged by God into a position and posture which resists the Devil, garners divine favour, gives

honourable testimony, and builds the moral character required by taking on the identity of being in the family of God.

3.3 Semantic analysis in 1 Peter

In 1 Peter, hypotassō is used six times, and includes some unique usages within the catholic letters. In this epistle is the only use of hypotassō outside of Romans 13 dealing with "subjection" to human governance; additionally and in alignment with the deutero-Pauline corpus, the majority of usages are found in household codes. In 1 Peter, the chief apostolic voice to early followers of the way instructs the Jewish diaspora and others who live as "aliens" amongst the nations, chosen by God (1 Peter 1:1-2), in how to live on this earth with a hope fixed in an imperishable inheritance and according to the resurrecting, protecting, and saving power of God.

3.3.1 Issues related to designative and associative context in 1 Peter

> *"The epistle is addressed to Christians who are suffering and afflicted. It is the author's aim to strengthen and comfort them in this time of trial. He seeks to employ in this takes the parenetic material that has been handed down, and in so doing he subordinates it to a unitary leading thought, the preservation of the Christians in their suffering" (Lohse 1986:42).*

Even though it has been described as existing at every point on the spectrum between the "storm centre of [NT] studies" and the "exegetical step-child" needing rehabilitation (Neill and Elliot in Michaels 1988), 1 Peter "[occupies] a rather modest place in the canon and in the historical reconstruction of Christian beginnings" (Michaels 1988:xxxi). The provenance of this short, but complex, epistle seems to deny logic as its elegance, practicality, and language seem improbable to have come from the hand of a Galilean fisherman, though "Aside from the four Gospels and the letters of Paul, the external attestation for 1 Peter is as strong, or stronger, than that for any NT book" (Michaels 1988:xxxiv). Osborne summarizes the arguments against Petrine authorship as "unconvincing", as:

a) Jobes' research found potential in Galilean Greek being better than supposed (and the use of an amanuensis is likely).
b) that there is nothing in evidence that precludes Peter from having been to Asia Minor (nor simply writing to churches somewhere he'd never been).

c) and, that "extensive Paulinisms […] are better explained by a common early church tradition"—concluding, quoting Marshall, that "if ever there was a weak case for pseudonymity, surely it is in respect to this letter" (Osborne 2011:132-133).

Though, Achtemeier famously argues against Petrine authorship, saying "the evidence adduced for that position is weak enough and the evidence against it strong enough to make it apposite to reject that as a possibility and to assume pseudonymity" (1996:43)—highlighting that consensus is far from reached either way. This said, that there is theological harmony hinting at a strong shared tradition between 1 Peter and Pauline literature is undeniable, Holtzmann states "literary dependence must be assumed at least to the epistles to the Romans and the Ephesians" (in Lohse 1986:40), and Lohse found that "the reciprocal echoes in ideas and formula are indeed numerous. However, these echoes are not limited to the Pauline epistles, but connections can also be show with James, Hebrews, the book of Revelation, the Synoptics, and the book of Acts" (1986:40). Lohse's study is important because it shows that one does not need to decide on authorship or date to find meaning in the epistle which "[certainly], […] in much greater measure than was previously assumed" used oral and even occasionally written materials and "[applied] them to the concrete situation of the church that was being addressed (Lohse 1986:42). In 1 Peter is not an absence of early Christian theology but a repackaged collection of it, and in a remarkably understandable form—Osborne states that thirty years of teaching 1 Peter "led [him] to fall in love with the richness of its theological message and the practicality of its presentation of the Christian life" (2011:131).

All of this is to say that these early parenetic texts, which include household codes, are closely connected to the deutero-Pauline corpus, and give a distinct opportunity to analyse the meaning of the terms and metaphors used within. 1 Peter is densely packed with direct and indirect citation of early church sources (quite possibly including eye-witness accounting of Jesus), and as Lohse argued, identifying and analysing these sources lets one "recognize more clearly the distinctiveness of the individual passage in the utilization of traditional material" (1986:42). As one reads the instructions within, it is important to remember that they are singular instances of an apostolic synthesis of other early instructions written to exhort followers of Jesus to a certain way of living in certain situations. To understand the uses of hypotassō in 1 Peter, there are two primary contextual considerations which I will briefly outline: one cultural, how an exemplar Christ meets and requires the demands of honour and shame; and one syntactic, the use of the imperatival participial form.

3.3.1.1 A milieu of honour and shame

It is impossible to analyse the intended meaning of a term like hypotassō in 1st-century Rome, Palestine, or Asia Minor without considering honour in the culture—especially when one is evaluating ethical, moral, and social parenesis.

In his socio-scientific evaluation of 1 Peter, Elliot notes that "in 1 Peter we meet for the first time those aspects of community which it is said eventually account for the church's ultimate ascendancy and consolidation within the Roman Empire: the distinctive communal identity of the Jesus movement, its solidarity in suffering, its radical promotion of social cohesion and fraternal love, and its offer of human dignity and place of belonging to society's dislocated strangers" (Elliott 2007:13). In looking at the various contexts of hypotassō, there is much discussion on power dynamics and hierarchy, but very little on how the term hypotassō might fit into the language of the complex honor-shame social dynamics of the culture in and around the early church. In modern vernacular, "submission" is usually associated with accepting of a position of "lower" power on the basis of an ontological or prominent power differential, and rarely associated with the more complicated social structure of the 1st century wherein relationships create a web of honor and shame, with honor being "the highest social value"—a society in which, quoting Dio Chrysostom, "fame is more precious than life (Rhod. 20)" and where "a man would consider it worth it to be destitute as long as he is well regarded by his fellow citizens (1 Glor. 2)" (Eng 2019:194). Eng notes that honour and shame discourse is often used throughout the Greco-Roman world to persuade one's audience (2019:194)—the pursuit and practice of honour is not something that needs to be taught to the original recipients, but rather the audience uses the inherent context of honour to interpret the instructions received. Interesting, Elliot notes that the language used in 1 Peter is "unusually rich in honor-shame and related terminology" marking the primary conflict being addressed as "one over honor and shame, grace and disgrace" and more than most other NT writing "[transposes] the issue of honor and shame into a theological key" (Elliot 2007:167).

In this part of my research, I struggled to find an evaluation how hypotassō fits into the language of honor and shame. Which I found interesting, as Elliot notes that "in Jewish and Christian circles, the books of Proverbs and Sirach, illustrative of conventional wisdom, abound with instruction concerning the honourable and shameful behaviour, particularly in regard to familial conduct" (Elliot 2007:169). It is worth noting that in the NT hypotassō is most often used in a familial context. There is a strong associative connection between the Torahic command to "honor your father and mother" (Ex. 20:12) and NT requirements of

hypotassō. A full analyzation of the relationship between hypotassō and honor needs to be explored, but such an investigation is outside the scope of this present research. This said, Elliot does a commendable job in collecting theological and anthropological studies on honour, providing a four-point summary of the features of honour-shame cultures, and I will briefly relay the aspects most pertinent to this study:

1) Members of shame cultures are group-oriented, as compared to our industrialized guilt culture. Meaning, these people are "governed in their attitudes and actions primarily by the opinion and appraisals of significant others" (2007:168)[19].
2) Social relationships are "viewed as essentially conflictual in nature" with honour being the contested commodity and it is a "zero-sum contest [where] one person's gain is another's loss". To ignore a challenge to one's honour results in shame (2007:168).
3) Males embody a family's honour and females the shame, which, quoting Gilmore, makes women "paradoxically powerful because of their potential for collective disgrace" (Gilmore in Elliot 2007:168).
4) Relying on Gouldner and Campbell, Elliot notes kinship "[distinguishes] the actors on the stage of conflict", furthermore emphasizing that "kinsmen inspire loyalty and obligation, stranger's distrust and moral indifference" (Campbell in Elliot 2007: 168).

A few initial observations are worth mentioning regarding the interpretation of hypotassō when viewing through a lens of honour and shame. Firstly, as men embody the honour of the family, then it stands to reason that hypotassō, being commanded in household codes towards male roles (fathers, husbands, masters), refers to accepting (or placing oneself) into an arrangement which directs the honour resultant from my wilful actions towards a honour-community's representative. Secondly, when adopting a more group-oriented mindset, it can be adduced that multiple individuals are pooled together into one unifying identity. If this is the case, then hypotassō not only denotes a relationship to a representative but also connotes obligations towards the others who are also attached to the shared representative. This is emphasized in understanding that the shameful actions of another in the community affects the social worth of the community as a whole, via the reputation of a singular representative. Thirdly, in the social conflict apparent in 1 Peter, becoming or being hypotassō is not the result of losing a challenge-riposte, or of being from a less honourable lineage, rather it seems that hypotassō has to do with the formation of groups

[19] Elliott notes that guilt and shame can both be in a culture, but concludes that shame is more prominent for the recipients of 1 Peter.

against each other. In this we see hints of the anachronistic, military use of hypotassō—here there is association with being arrayed or put into a useful formation, or even, of being a subject of a sovereign. While the resultant relationship implied by hypotassō can require obedience, selflessness, humility, and even at times active servility, the relationship is more importantly a platform for winning honour and assigning glory.

From an honour-shame perspective, the relationships resulting from hypotassō seem to be a community of people who: willingly accept direction from a leader and each other, respect and uphold obligations to each other, direct the credit for their actions towards a shared representative, and reap the rewards of victory together. These considerations of solidarity, humility, co-inspiration, and the wilful and active, even enterprising, activity towards a common goal must be considered when analysing the semantics of hypotassō.

3.3.1.2 The use of an imperatival participle

There is a long-standing, rather unsettled, debate regarding the existence, classification, and interpretation of "imperative participles" in NT writings. It would be remiss of me not to at least speak to this issue as "examples in 1 Peter are often cited as evidence" (Jobes 2005:200) and "even among those who have taken up the challenge, the results are somewhat inconclusive. For this reason, the usage remains enigmatic and, as a result, often miscommunicated" (Williams 2011:59).

At the start of this brief section, it should be noted that the majority of modern scholarship, regardless of how the participle is classified, maintain that at least some level of imperatival force is carried with the three imperatival participial uses of hypotassō in 1 Peter (Jobes 2005:201; Arichea & Nida 1980; Williams 2011:60-64). It is not my intention to enter this discussion, but I do want to highlight some pertinent ideas that might affect one's understanding of hypotassō.

William's study, which looked at classical, NT, and papyri sources to analyse the potential for and meaning of the "imperative participle" form evaluated both the denotive and conative value of the form, and how it might affect one's understanding. In "piecing this information together" he found that the denotative value becomes clear: the function is used to engage the volition of the recipients in order to direct them toward a particular action. Such direction can be communicated both in a strong or mild manner" (Williams 2011:74). Regardless if one attributes these form as "milder", Semitic appeal (Daube 1947) or as participle of mode

which describes a finite verb (Achtemeier 1996:194), these statements clearly carry an authorial intention of exhortation.

However, counter to Williams, who found that there is no connotative difference between imperatives in finite or participle form, I tend to agree with Jobes (2005:189) and Achtemeier (1996:194-195) that the author's selection of a participle, instead of a finite verbs as is used elsewhere in 1 Peter, means *something*. The indistinctness inherent to a participle, especially when interpreting into English, creates a situation where "the context plays a major role in determining the force of the Greek participle" and "the student is encouraged to translate the force of the participle with more than an—ing gloss" (Wallace 1996:623). In 1 Peter, the so-called "imperative participles" are buried in ethical and moral exhortation, with complex social context and varied textual and oral sources—mostly Jewish; the lists of finite and participial phrases are interlinked. We are not evaluating a simple list of commands written in bad Koiné, but something more elegant and delicate—something that speaks to both instruct and encourage a suffering community in a bad situation.

3.3.1.3 Christ as exemplar

> *For you have been called for this purpose, since Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example for you to follow in His steps, who committed no sin, nor was any deceit found in Him mouth; and while being reviled, He did not revile in return; while suffering, He uttered no threats, but kept entrusting Himself to Him who judges righteously; and He Himself bore our sins in His body on the cross, so that we might die to sin and live to righteousness; for by His wounds you were healed. For you were continually straying like sheep, but now you have returned to the Shepherd and Guardian of your souls." (1 Peter 2:21-24 NASB)*

God (theos) is named 39 times in 1 Peter, more than any other term (Osborne 2011:136), it is the author's Christology that forms the centre-point of theology in the epistle (Osborne 2011:138; Michaels 1988:lxix; Charles 2006:293). The passage quoted above is found in the middle of the household codes of 1 Peter; and while some scholars think these words are an adaptation of an early hymn, Osborne, building upon Achtemeier, Jobes, Michaels, and Osborne, argues that on account of "so much emphasis on Jesus' passion and its salvific effects in this epistle. It is best to see this as Peter's contribution, not a borrowed Christian hymn; it is high prose that deserves to be set in poetic form (2011:200).

Along these lines of recognizing the import of this passage in understanding the parenesis in 1 Peter, Charles finds exhortation in this reminder of the Christian calling,

> *"The words 'To this you were called' a reiteration of the conditions of basic Christian discipleship, and the call of Jesus is to 'take up the cross' and 'follow' him (Mt 10:38; 16:24; Mk 8:34; Lk 9:23; 14:27). For this reason, the saints are called to 'follow in his steps.' In recalling Jesus' penetrating post-resurrection challenge to Peter to 'follow' (Jn 21:19), Peter's failure earlier in his life to do precisely this doubtless imbues his present exhortation to 'follow in his steps' with deep meaning." (Charles 2006:325)*

There is an identifiable imprint of both the Jesus tradition and the deeply personal impact of Jesus' teachings on the apostles engrained in this epistle. Every instruction, every admonition, every hope-giving affirmation, and every hard-to-accept reality was meant to be interpreted through the mindset that a *Christian* strives to be just that—Christ-like.

Michaels effectively explains this mindset in discussing the ethics of 1 Peter. The oft-repeated ideal of "doing good" in the epistle "is not simply identifiable with maintaining the social status quo. Peter has a rather more specific meaning in mind than his terminology suggests. To 'do good' is to do the will of God, especially in situations where one suffers for it (cf. 2:15; 3:17; 4:19), but even more specifically it is to fulfil the spirit (if not the letter) of Jesus' command to love one's enemies" (Michaels 1988:lxxiv). Even though this command is not directly quoted, it is clear that the author, by repeatedly emphasizing humility, gentleness, and nonretaliation as the proper response to even severe opposition, pragmatically explains "In the broadest sense such behaviour is right because it is the 'will of God,' but concretely it means following the teaching and example of Jesus" (Michaels 1988:lxxiv). Charles expands this even further, arguing, "Christ's example is compelling for several reasons. Not only did his vicarious suffering bring about redemption and not only did he not respond in kind, but through his own suffering he also established solidarity with the saints" (2006:325).

As I turn to analyse the direct contexts of hypotassō in 1 Peter, it is important to remember the over-arching idea that Christ is to be an exemplar of behaviour. Put more simply, the author of 1 Peter would not command Christians to do anything that Christ would not have done, and in fact, the instructions given are not so much new propositions, but rather reminders of the behaviour, attitudes, and intentions modelled by Christ himself.

3.3.2 1 Peter 2:13

Ὑποτάγητε πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει διὰ τὸν κύριον (UBS5)
Submit yourselves for the Lord's sake to every human institution (NASB)

There really is an amazing amount of paradox, dissonance, and room for eisegesis in this simple seeming phrase. As with Romans 13 and Titus 3:1, there seems to be strong evidence of an early Christian tradition represented in household codes and the commands to "submit to authorities", but as Michaels notes, texts from the NT, Greek and Roman literature, nor even Jewish Hellenistic sources "furnish proof of any single standardized household duty code on which Peter—or anyone else—can be assumed to have drawn. At most they exhibit a general similarity of theme and a concern for maintaining proper order in the household, and therefore in a given subculture or in society at large" (1988:122). There are subtleties in this context, and another hapax legomena, ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει, which complicate interpretation. Did the same apostolic voice famous for saying "We must obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29b NASB) preach submission to government? Following in the Jesus tradition, should one interpret his, oft quoted, statement, "Render to Caesar what is Caesar's and to God what is God's" (Matthew 2:21, Mark 22:21, Luke 20:25) as meaning do whatever a government asks in submission? In the verses leading up to this context, the author powerfully and emphatically defines his readers as "A chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession" (1 Pet. 3:9 NASB); as "the people of God" (v10); and as "aliens and strangers" among the Gentiles (v11-12). Why would the author turn around so quickly and command these chosen ones to live in subordination and submission to the authorities from whom God took possession and saved them? Are Christians "on loan" back to the same powers which previously enslaved them? Certainly, one needs to wrestle with the meaning of the aorist imperative Ὑποτάγητε in order to figure out what is being expected of the early church.

Now, I should mention that modern commentators do not argue for understanding hypotassō as complete submission. Quoting Osborne, who builds upon previously established scholarship, "[Ὑποτάγητε] means to 'place yourself under the authority of' or 'subordinate yourself to' another, but it has no hint of inferiority attached to it" (2011:193). This understanding of hypotassō, however, leads to some theological and ethical quandaries, of which the most perplexing is: in placing myself under another's authority, I must obey their commands (as to not obey is rebellion against God-ordained authority, thus God Himself), but they may ask me to do something that is disallowed by God. Now, Osborne (and most others), simply answer this question by saying, in-line with Peter's Act's quote, that one must

obey God before man (2011:193; Michaels 1998:124)—thus hedging the imperative "to submit" as it were. However, this command "to submit" is an apostolic, and understood by the church (then and now) to be divine, command in-and-of-itself. What criteria exists for one to judge which of God's commands takes precedence in any given scenario? Sure, there seems to be easy, "extreme" case examples: modern-day slavery; punitive, deforming responses to crime; adultery; murder; or suicide; but even these are not so simply resolved. Was it sinful for an ancient Israelite to not take someone's eye? What did Hosea think about sleeping with a prostitute? Is the Protestant "just-war" tradition, that when "all other remedies have failed, Jesus' demand for sacrificial love may require us to use lethal force" (Hoekema 1986:918), justified under submission to government?

While it may seem I am arguing a hyperbole, it breaks my heart than I am not. Certain scriptural texts, when understood as "submission to government" have been used to justify racism, slavery, apartheid, corporal punishment, and Nazism as Biblical, or even Christ-like (Hoekema 1986:919). Now, I am not digressing into a full argument for pacificism, but I simply want to highlight the ethical and rational problems that occur when one starts to place divine commands against each other, rather than accepting them fully. More succinctly, understanding hypotassō as submission or subordination creates a logical framework requiring only limited compliance to the instruction itself. This is a paradox, and creating theology based on hedging commands against each other is not the most reverent approach. Bartsch talks about this kind of rational (in context of pacifism), saying,

> *"This is most evident with the assumption of an 'extreme case' in which the transgression of the commandment is supposed to be no transgression. The nonpacifists have to use the concept of extreme case, which in itself gives evidence that their way of arguing is casuistic. On the other hand, 'extreme obedience' is the least casuistic and legalistic, since any argument about cases is excluded. To argue about cases would mean to doubt the validity of the commandment. Thus extreme obedience is the only way to avoid casuistry while holding to the aim of obedience. But extreme obedience actually leads a step beyond mere obedience insofar as obedience is understood as a human endeavor or achievement." (Bartsch 1968:21)*

All of this to say, I do not think that the author of 1 Peter was trying to create an ethical dilemma—rhetorically speaking, that would be no way to approach an audience suffering abuse and looking for encouragement. The author was giving a command that could be followed completely, thus our understanding of the term must not require complex, external

qualifications. It seems that hypotassō must be understood with more nuance. Interestingly, Charles argues that the language in this context "[containing] the verb hypotassō reflects the Greco-Roman primacy of respect for order", and as such "to 'submit' is a form of honor and respect, and Peter's concern is that Christians be motivated by respect at every level" (2006:320). Michaels also considers this line of thought, seeing in hypotassō association with deference more than obedience or subjection (1988:123).

This draws us into a brief discussion on the term ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει, as the command to hypotassō has it as a dative target; scholarly consensus is split between understanding this term as "human beings" or "human institutions/authority" (Osborne 2011:192). If one embraces the former, then hypotassō becomes more about the power differential in interpersonal relationships; if the later, the term focusses on systems and "existing powers" through which "the Lord accomplishes his purposes" (Charles 2006:322). BDAG allows for both interpretations, though it recommends "human institution" for 1 Pet. 2:13; interestingly, BDAG notes that, "To a Hellene a well-ordered society was primary (s. Aristot., Pol. 1, 1, 1, 1252). It was understood that the function of government was to maintain such a society, and the moral objective described in vs. 14 is in keeping with this goal" (BDAG 2000:573). If one looks through this lens of authorized systems implemented to enable a shared cultural value, we can start to tease out a nuance in the associative semantics of hypotassō—"the notion of recognition. The recognition underscored by Peter and reiterated by Paul in Romans 13 is that authority in its generic form derives from the Creator. The recognition that all authority is owing to God is not qualified in either Peter or Paul by those who exercise the authority, whether just or unjust" (Charles 2006:322). To the original recipients of 1 Peter, one's relationship to the institutionalized systems of societal regulation provided a platform to practice the unique ideologies of early Christianity in such a way that it would play the oppressive social systems against themselves. The actions implicated by hypotassō could be executed in such a way that a Christian could be "extremely obedient" without giving to man anything that was owed to God.

This understanding of hypotassō—semantically shifting from subordination and submission towards acceptance, deference, or respect—is reflected in the entire passage v13-17. In v14, the author reminds Christians that representatives of these human institutions are put in place "to punish those who do evil and to praise those who do good (ἀγαθοποιός)", and then immediately makes clear the reason that one of God's own chosen should respect human institutions, "For this is the will of God, that by doing good (ἀγαθοποιέω) you should put to silence the ignorance of foolish people" (1 Peter 2:15 NASB). The earthly agents of

government have been ordained by God to praise those who do good, so the "sojourners and exiles" are encouraged to set themselves up in such a way to uphold the God-ordained function of human institutions for the purpose of receiving benefit (praise and honor) which disproves and refutes the ones persecuting the Christian community. In context, this imperative to Ὑποτάγητε is paired with an exhortation,

> *"Beloved, I urge you as aliens and strangers to abstain from fleshly lusts which wage war against the soul. Keep your behavior excellent among the Gentiles, so that in the thing in which they slander you as evildoers, they may because of your good deeds, as they observe them, glorify God in the day of visitation." (1 Peter 2:11-12 NASB).*

In this context, hypotassō is about setting oneself up to do observable good deeds which will not only refute persecutors, but even bring them into the Christian community. Michaels provides an excellent discussion for understanding good deeds in 1 Peter, explaining,

> *"Peter's emphasis […] is on action: 'doing good,' not 'being good,' is what is required. […] The point is not that one 'does good' by deference or subjection, but just the opposite: i.e., that one fulfills the conventional social expectations of the culture by 'doing good.' This means that 'doing good' is not simply identifiable with maintaining the social status quo. […] more specifically it is to fulfill the spirit (if not the letter) of Jesus' command to love one's enemies. […] Peter makes a serious attempt to do justice to the command to love one's enemies as well [with] recurring emphasis on humility, gentleness, and nonretaliation as the proper responses toward those who slander and oppress the Christian community." (Michaels 1988:lxxiv)*

Interestingly, and adding another paradox, the author recognized the recipients of the letter as "free men", but with the admonition to use one's freedom as "bondslaves of God" (v16); and this context to *hypotassō to human institutions for the Lord's sake* is ended with, "Honor all people, love the brotherhood, fear God, honor the king" (v17). It is worth noting that honor, respect, and arrangement for good works can all be done for and directed to humans, but reverence and fear is reserved for God. The nature of the relationship of "subjection" to human authorities does not replace nor overwrite one's status as a servant of God. The author makes clear that a Christian's relationship to human authority does not necessitate a compromise of Christian values. So, this context reveals hypotassō as having semantic implications of aligning one's self with the God-ordained functions of human authorities in

an observably honorable way. Connecting with the Jesus tradition, Osborne notes, “Caesar deserves our honor and respect, but only God deserves our fear. Caesar can kill us or throw us in prison, but he is only human, deserving the same ‘honor’ we give all people” (2011:195), and quoting McKnight concludes, “this submission ‘can now be understood to include obedience, protest, and at times even civil disobedience.’” (2011:195).

So, now that we’re clear as mud in the midst of ethical paradox, we can start to tease out some associative semantics for hypotassō in 1 Peter 2:13. In this context, Spicq’s emphasis on understanding submission as acceptance of what God has ordained (1994:426) takes on a tangible importance. If one is to apply (or obey) the command to hypotassō completely, and apply the qualifying prepositional phrase “for the Lord’s sake”, then the term cannot mean capitulation of one’s will to another human or human authority. Rather, as the embodiment of doing God’s will, one is to do good works according to the rules and stipulations of human-created institutions. The authority in question belongs to God, as it is God who ordains the authority delegated to the institutions, and God who is ordering his own chosen people into those systems in order to accomplish His purposes. Charles contends that, “If the Christian community is going to demonstrate both coherence and relevance in a pagan context, faith will show itself viable in the way it understands and responds to authority […] Christians, above all social groupings, will be responsible in their attitude toward varying forms of authority. In the end, social responsibility will authenticate Christian witness” (2006:320-321). Put more simply, here, hypotassō means to deny one’s own will and fleshly desires in order to pursue God’s will, with the understanding that God will assign, or place, us into human institutions so that “the exemplary behavior of Christians will change the minds of their accusers and in effect ‘overcome evil with good’ (Michaels 1988:120).

Interestingly, Michaels notes that, “the most conspicuous feature of this section is its optimism” (1988:132). The passage opened with an aorist passive imperative Ὑποτάγητε does not present the human institutions or ruling authority figures as the oppressors, nor “submission” to authorities in a pejorative manner. Rather, “Christians should defer to their fellow citizens and to the state because the state is their protector against false accusations” and since “Christians can silence their accusers simply by doing what is right. Under normal circumstances loyalty to God and loyalty to the empire will not come into conflict.” (Michaels 1988:132).

While there is flexibility on how one understands the ideas of subjection or submission, in this context, the imperative hypotassō seems to connote:

1) Willing acceptance of a God-ordained assignment into a human-created social system.
2) Upholding or supporting the rules of engagement within a social structure for the purpose of refuting detractors and allowing outsiders the ability to observe your righteous deeds (holiness) so that the church's witness is authenticated.
3) Behavior towards human authorities and social structures which upholds the ideals of a well-ordered society, seeks to love and honor others above self, and persists in the face of suffering—even when outsiders might expect retaliation or revolt.
4) Instead of pursuing one's own will (which could possibly include sinful intent of revolt, rebellion, vengeance, or evil action), to willingly accept orders from God and the implications of one's social position, while preferring and seeking to honor others and act in a way that honors the community as a whole.

So, all this said, in 1 Peter 2:13, the author creates a set of priorities for his readers, not a set of exclusions, wherein "Their responsibilities to others, to each other, to God, and to the state are simultaneously affirmed, but with the tacit understanding that the religious commitment to God and the brotherhood inevitably limits and qualifies the civic commitment to the empire and its citizens" (Michaels 1988: 132).

3.3.3 1 Peter 2:18, 3:1, 3:5

These three contexts will all be handled together in this section, as they are each imperatival participles, found linked in the chiastic structure, which itself produces the epistles "central icon, the passion of the Christ" (Green 2007:4). In syntactical form, these contexts seem to be another set of household codes, but unlike those in the deutero-Pauline corpus, these have direct reference to LXX materials, and include exemplars of how the embedded imperatives should be lived out. While I will discuss intertextual relationships with other household codes in more details later, I now want to focus on what one can understand by the participle use of hypotassō in reference to wives and slaves.

I want to start by reflecting first on ἐλεύθερος (free man), a concept with long-standing, deep cultural meaning which carries into these contexts from verse 16. This term is both a technical term for the social status of "freedmen" and is a vital social value; thus "terms connected with it, both on the positive and on the negative scale, are extremely important in Greek social and ethical context" (Volt 2003:70). Now, while there is room to discuss the temporal and societal aspects of various household codes, there are certain themes which

seem to have carried across time and space, and the social strata, roles of authority, and attitude towards genders and social classes share much in common (Dudrey 1999:27-39; Volt 2003:69; Lovik 1995:54-56). At the very least, some overarching characterizations of the household codes can be traced from Plato to Aristotle to Ben Sirach to Philo. In his commentary, Charles notes that,

> *"NT scholarship has recognized in 2:13–3:7 a standard code of duties governing social relations [...] These obligations range from civic duty to familial obligations at various 'stations' of life and had become popularized in Stoic notions of morality. […] It is only natural that the early Christians would adopt this feature into their writings" (Charles 2006:321).*

In analyzing freedom and slavery in Greek household codes, Volt highlights that a "slave was not expected–as the citizen was–to display the virtues of loyalty, good faith and self-sacrifice. It was usually taken for granted that a slave could not be trusted", and, furthermore, "We may even find the sentiment that a slave of good character is a better man than a free citizen of bad character" (2003:70). In discussing the morality found in Greek household codes, Dover discusses the difference between slaves and free men at length, noting the association between slaves and foreigners,

> *"Since slaves were often of foreign birth, captives in war, or the children of captives, their 'natural' relation to their individual owners […] generally was assumed to be enmity and resentment […] being denied so many opportunities to choose between courses of action, the slave was not expected—as the citizen was expected—to display the virtues of loyalty, good faith, and self-sacrifice. […] By contrast with the slave, the free men was expected not to be dominated by fear, but to take the path of toil and sacrifice wherever there was a choice between pleasure or safety on the one hand and honour or service to the community on the other; a free man (literally) 'thinks big', has self-respect, magnamity and honourable ambitions and is not distracted by short-term pleasure or gain" (Dover 1974:114-155)*

Dover even recounts a narrative wherein an old slave, sentenced to die for his master's secret, declares that "such a death confers good repute on a slave" (1974:114). It is interesting that the author of 1 Peter introduces his version of household codes with the command translated "submit yourselves to human institutions" but in doing so "act as free men". The modern implications of submission might color the modern reader's understanding of the overarching command to hypotassō as something close to "accept

your position as a slave" or "accept your position under" these earthly institutions. However, when confronted with the ideology represented in the ancient codes, different associations seem to arise. Slaves are not recognized as even having a choice to submit "willfully", as their submissive position is essential not willful. The action of hypotassō is something that can be chosen to be done as a free man, and furthermore, the epistle's author reinforces the ideology recognized by Dover when he says, "For this finds favor, if for the sake of conscience toward God a person bears up under sorrows when suffering unjustly" (1 Peter 2:19 NASB). The commands embedded within the opening to these household codes—to use one's freedom, do good works, to honor all people, to love the brotherhood, and honor the king—are used to describe hypotassō and all find meaning as the actions of citizens or free men, not from the expected demeanor of slaves. This understanding of hypotassō starts to undo a seeming paradox. With this cultural alignment, one's understanding of hypotassō might shift towards "despite your position, take on the burden of the magnanimous and honourable ambitions expected of a free man". Interestingly, 1 Peter 2:16 ends with the implied command to use freedom "as bondslaves of God" (NASB)—while the idea of a dual-identity will be explored more later, I want to suggest that this phrase reminds the reader that primary obligation, commitment, and responsibility lies in relationship to God, not to the system of man.

Now, to look at each context more specifically--the first, 1 Peter 2:18, "Servants, be submissive to your masters with all respect, not only to those who are good and gentle, but also to those who are unreasonable" resembles household codes based on the master-slave relationship. This context does not directly add anything to clarify an understanding of hypotassō, as Michaels notes, for slaves the

> *"emphasis […] is not on the normal situation in which their masters are just and fair but on abnormal situations in which they are treated cruelly. The point of the passage is not submission or deference for its own sake; this was only the expected thing in the social setting to which and from which he writes. The accent is rather on the proper response to hostility or mistreatment by those who are in power" (Michaels 1988:152).*

The author does, however, in v20 provide the reasoning that to "find favor with God" one should "patiently endure any suffering caused by doing good". So, it is possible that in following to command to hypotassō, one might suffer, but that suffering can have a purpose. Michaels notes that, here, "the servants in the stereotyped household duty code can be used effectively as stand-ins for all Christian believers in the provinces of Asia Minor" (1988:52),

and within this instruction “he has in mind the common experience of all believers in the Roman Empire, not the unique predicament of slaves […] his readers could hardly miss the point that ‘suffering unjustly’ (v 19) was a real possibility for any of them” (1988:152). As Osborne mentions, views on slavery varied, even within various Hellenized cultures (2011:197), but generally speaking “Slaves were in some kind of employment relationship with their masters” (2011:199); in speaking through this form, the author is communicating “respect the management team, submit to the foreman, be willing to be misused” and for Christians then (and now), he explains that “one’s secular career is actually a God-given ministry to which each person is called by God, and that call is every bit as important as the missionary or the pastor. Our secular life is part of our walk with God” (2011:199). The message in this context is one of how to handle the mistreatment inherent in our varied and complicated professional relationships, not an endorsement of slavery.

It is worth noting that the imagery surrounding this context was intended to bring to mind Jesus’ own identity as a suffering servant and his own teachings regarding bearing burdens and suffering injustice. I will discuss these after looking at the instructions given to wives and husbands.

The remaining uses of hypotassō in 1 Peter’s household codes are found in the instructions given to wives. This parenetic is useful as the author uses marriage to illustrate hypotassō more specifically. Using a passive participle, wives are commanded to hypotassō for the purpose of winning over “disobedient” husbands (1 Peter 3:1). This “winning over” can come about “without a word”, simply by the “behavior of the wife” (v1); conduct characterized as: ἐν φόβῳ (reverent) and ἁγνὴν (holy/chaste); with further imagery of adorning one’s heart with ἐν τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ τοῦ πραέως καὶ ἡσυχίου πνεύματος (v4b UBS5)—the “imperishable quality of a humble and quiet spirit” (Michaels 1988:161). Furthermore, women are given Sarah to use as an ancient example of what this looks like when the author references her as ὑπήκουσεν (obedient) and mentions that she called her husband κύριον (master/lord). None of these qualifications stretch an understanding of hypotassō in any difficult way—to deny one’s own human impulsivity and act in reverence (implicitly towards God); to respect; to maintain purity and faithfulness within social relationships, and to ensure an inner heart of humility and restraint are all fairly straight-forward, even common in NT literature. Michaels argues that there is nothing specifically feminine as each of these attitudes are commanded to all Christians in various contexts (1988:162).

What several commentators note, and might be most illuminating, is that in this culture, if a woman becomes a Christ-follower without her husband, she has already “refused her

husband's loyalties, religious or otherwise" (Charles 2006:330), and "to go against her husband and accept Christ was scandalous. Perhaps many husbands were among those slandering the church in 2:12" (Osborne 2011:207). Quoting Jobes, Osborne explains "[a wife's] worship of Christ would be perceived as rebellion, causing embarrassment to her husband and hurting his status in the community: He could be disqualified from offices, and she would have friends in her church that would demean him in the eyes of others" (2011:207). This cultural understanding limits the application of hypotassō within this context, as a wife should respond to "her situation in life by living as any Christian should live" and only "Up to a point, this means doing what society expects" (Michaels 1988:171). The command is not given to put a rebellious wife back into her place, rather, it infers a set of behaviors which constitute "good works" useful in bringing her husband into the family of God. As with slaves, these inferences will find ultimate definition in an exemplary Christ, as here, wives here are simply told that "In every aspect of her family life the love of Christ and the grace of God must be visible. As her husband watches this transformation, his coldness toward her will melt and opposition disappear. This will lead to his conversion" (Osborne 2011:208).

While hypotassō is not directly used, husbands are also instructed in this passage via the imperative: ἀπονέμοντες τιμὴν ("assign/show/accord honor") to their wives as "a fellow heir of the grace of life" (v7). Again, thinking about the cultural norms into which this was written, the command is counter-cultural, surprising, and highly informative as to the expectations of a husband and wife within a marriage. Charles reflects on this saying that "respect" is the thread which links all the elements of the household codes in Peter (2006:330). The command for husbands to honor is connected to hypotassō through the conjunction ὁμοίως (likewise, similarly, in the same way [BDAG]), and it "becomes immediately apparent to the reader that Peter maintains equality within the existing social conventions" (Charles 2006:330). After comparing ancient, contemporary, and NT household codes against the instructions to husband and wives in 1 Peter, Lu posits an understanding hypotassō as "finding and occupying responsibly one's place in society, not resignation" and beautifully states the implications of such semantics by concluding, "Harmony would no longer be displayed by the proper ruling order in the household; rather it is lived out in mutual honor between household members" (Lu 2016:12).

Chiasm in 1 Peter 2-3

2:13–17: instruction for everyone

2:18–20: instruction for slaves

2:21–25: the example of Christ

3:1–7: instruction for wives/husbands

3:8-9: instruction for everyone

Figure 1

Now, I've been alluding to the exemplarity of Christ and how it relates to understanding hypotassō in 1 Peter. In the center of this chiastic structure of household codes (Lu 2016:12; Green 2007:72) is the high prose (Osborne 2011:201)—possibly hymnic (Goppelt 1993:247–250) or midrash (Michaels 1988:137)—which connects Jesus Christ with the "suffering servant" of Isaiah 53. Now, while this is not a direct context for hypotassō, this section is framed in the instructions which repeatedly use the term, and I will highlight some implications that arise. Note, I do not have space to fully exegete this passage but will simply mention the most notable features for this discussion.

There are three important correlations helpful in developing the semantics for hypotassō. First, In the opening statement, *"since Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example for you to follow in His steps"* (1 Peter 2:21b NASB), believers are told that Christ's suffering is an example, ὑπογραμμός, to be followed. The term ὑπογραμμός is rare term used "for an outline of the letters of the alphabet that schoolchildren could copy or trace when learning to write" (Osborne 2011:201). One cannot conceive that in the parenesis surrounding this identification of Jesus Christ as an example to be emulated that the instructions would be counter to what Jesus taught or the practical example of his life. In other words, the author is presenting his readers with the interpretative lens necessary to understand the surrounding parenesis. TDNT says that hypogrammos "refers to the tracks that Christ has left as examples for us to follow, not in imitation but in commitment to his way of suffering" (Schrenk in Bromiley 1985:133). There are two important implications I want to note:

1) if Jesus' life and actions were to be exemplary, and a part of his purpose was to make disciples, then following in his footsteps means striving to be an example for others—something made clear in the household code for wives.
2) the imagery invoked throughout this passage alludes to Jesus' life and his teachings (Michaels 1988:146)—while not specifically quoting them, there is clear reference in this passage to "Bless those who curse you, pray for those who denounce you" (Luke 6:28); "whoever slaps you on your right cheek, turn to him the other" (Matt. 5:39); and "whoever forces you to go one mile, go with him two" (Matt. 5:41).

To appropriately interpret hypotassō through this lens requires one to answer the questions "how did Jesus treat the authority of human institutions?", "what did Jesus teach about

suffering abuse?", and "how can I act in a way that encourages, even inspires, emulation even in the face of unjust suffering?"

While the topic of Jesus' ethics is largely out-of-scope for this thesis, the author's logic and modern commentators remind me of Wink's non-violent resistance theology[20]; in writing against apartheid in 1987, he said,

> *"Some readers may object to the idea of discomforting the soldier or embarrassing the creditor. But how can people who are engaged in oppressive acts repent unless made uncomfortable with their actions? There is, admittedly, the danger of using nonviolence as a tactic of revenge and humiliation. There is also, at the opposite extreme, an equal danger of sentimentality and softness that confuses the uncompromising love of Jesus with being nice. Loving confrontation can free both the oppressed from docility and the oppressor from sin" (Wink 1987:22)*

Pacificism and passivity are not the same, and similarly, Jesus never condones sin nor adopts a posture and position which implicitly supports it, rather, he finds a way to enable, encourage, and invite anyone, anywhere to follow him.

Secondly, in synthesizing Isaiah 53 with the passion of Jesus, the author emphasizes the three primary qualifications for understanding the surrounding parenesis:

1) while being reviled, he did not revile.
2) while suffering, he uttered no threats.
3) he kept entrusting himself to Him who judges righteously

As Osborne notes, this is "an obvious paradigm for the readers in the midst of persecution" (2011:202). The implications of hypotassō within human relationships cannot be used to direct someone's faith from being placed primarily in God. To hypotassō is to put your trust primarily in God, and only secondarily to anyone else.

Thirdly, the "delicate nature of the themes being addressed" (Charles 2006:325) and the arrangement of this instruction to follow in Christ's footsteps amidst instruction to honor and

[20] "To an oppressed people, Jesus is saying, Do not continue to acquiesce in your oppression by the Powers; but do not react violently to it either. Rather, find a third way, a way that is neither submission nor assault, flight nor fight, a way that can secure your human dignity and begin to change the power equation, even now, before the revolution. Turn your cheek, thus indicating to the one who backhands you that his attempts to shame you into servility have failed. Strip naked and parade out of court, thus taking the momentum of the law and the whole debt economy and flipping them, jujitsu-like, in a burlesque of legality.
Walk a second mile, surprising the occupation troops by placing them in jeopardy with their superiors. In short, take the law and push it to the point of absurdity." (Wink W 1998. The Powers that Be: Theology for a New Millennium)

respect and be subordinated to evil masters and husbands is intensely complex, as Charles notes, “Christ’s example is compelling for several reasons. Not only did his vicarious suffering bring about redemption and not only did he not respond in kind, but through his own suffering he also established solidarity with the saints” (2006:325). There is a high calling here—through the actions implied by hypotassō, do we likewise establish solidarity with the ones to whom we’re subordinated? Hypotassō must be associated with conduct that shows the requisite honor and respect to garner favor, and the resolute and gentle humility that can win over a sinful husband. The author shows “conviction that Christian faith transform relationships” and the author “is not calling his readers passively to embrace abuse” but “Christians are to resist taking justice into their own hands” (2006:326). Michaels summarizes similarly, saying, “Christ left behind an example for them to follow, an example of nonretaliation, whether in word or deed, and of quiet confidence in the righteous judgment of God. Those who have followed the way that he made for them will find that it leads back to Christ himself” (1988:153).

The household codes are capped with a set of admonitions which “reinforce more explicitly and on a more general scale the models of Christian character” (Michaels 1988:173) previously presented and a Psalm (Psa. 33 LXX) to “buttress his paraenetic teaching” (Charles 2006:332). This is helpful as the author clarifies his meanings on a Scriptural basis. While the proverbial jury is still out on if similarities between 1 Peter 3 and Romans 12 proves a textual reliance (Osborne 2011:214), there is certainly evidence of shared catechetical material—Osborne, quoting Jobes, states, “this passage eloquently demonstrates that the two (Jesus’ teaching and early tradition) cannot be separated” (2011:214). While this transitionary closing statement does not include hypotassō, it certainly helps shape one’s interpretation. I will let the author do the talking,

> *“To sum up, all of you be harmonious, sympathetic, brotherly, kindhearted, and humble in spirit; not returning evil for evil or insult for insult, but giving a blessing instead; for you were called for the very purpose that you might inherit a blessing. For, ‘The one who desires life, to love and see good days, must keep his tongue from evil and his lips from speaking deceit. He must turn away from evil and do good; he must seek peace and pursue it. For the eyes of the Lord are toward the righteous, and His ears attend to their prayer, but the face of the Lord is against those who do evil.” (1 Peter 3:8-12 NASB)*

The author's intended connotations of hypotassō are found in this list of imperatives. The actions commanded are not ones of servility, passivity, or acquiescence; rather, to hypotassō means to dress yourself in humility and seek ways to honor, respect, empathize, and forge solidarity within one's social and civic relationships. Certainly, hypotassō does not leave room to speak evil or seek deception, but it is taking on the mindset, spirit, and endurance required to pursue peace, even with one's enemies.

Charles concludes, albeit speaking in terms of submission,

> *"The perspective of 1 Peter is that faith works through—rather than invalidating—social conventions. Moreover, submission on an earthly level, while voluntary, is rooted in a submission to the heavenly Master and balanced by a strong emphasis on God's authority, judgment, and providential care" (Charles 2006:333).*

Michaels take a different angle, stating "the 'blessing' associated with the future coming of Christ […] belongs to those who demonstrate good works" (1988:182). It would seem the point of the repeated command to hypotassō is to engage in doing what is right—there is no connotation of capitulation or passive compliance. He concludes by stating the author's clear intent "to prepare them [Christians] for faithful discipleship whatever the social cost." (1988:182).

These imperatival participles in 1 Peter 2:18-3:5 help qualify an understanding of hypotassō by connecting the term with the life and teachings of Christ, and through their use to embed Christian parenesis in Hellenistic household codes. The semantic features arising from this discussion be summarized, hypotassō:

1) Refers to a willing acceptance of the honorable ambitions a free man takes on as a part of a social structure (i.e. family, marriage); even when these intentions are burdensome, require sacrifice, or are costly, the service done to the community is valuable and in successful performance of these deeds, the burden-carrier displays loyalty and good faith towards the community within the social structure in question.
2) Recognizing that subordination within human authority structures can lead to hostility and abuse, hypotassō connotes a willing acceptance to patiently endure while still seeking to honor and respect others in the community, as one's conduct in the face of unjust suffering is in itself a witness of Christ and Christ-like character.
3) Refers to conduct characterized by holiness and respect and requires the adoption of an internal attitude of humility, patience, and gentleness—being gracious to make

visible to others the internal transformation brought about by the love of Christ and the grace of God.

4) Is associated with the Christ-like attributes of non-retaliation, reliance on God, humility in the face of offense, and servant leadership, and when one acts like Christ, one becomes an example which can be followed (thus continuing a cycle of discipleship).

Before moving onto the next context, I want to briefly touch on the topic of honor. In evaluating 1 Peter as a document concerned primarily with honor, Elliot lists hypotassō in a semantic category with "to honor" and defines it as "[showing] respect for authority, order, and social status" (1996:174-175). He concludes that the public shaming which served as cause and context for the writing of 1 Peter was "unrelenting abuse [resulting] in undeserved suffering on the part of the believers and if unchecked could have led to their demoralization, despair, or even defection. The response to this situation that the letter's author recommends is not the conventional one of returning insult for insult but rather engagement in honorable conduct" (Elliot 1996:173-174), thus the recipients, "honored by God" are encouraged to resist conformity and assimilation and "stand fast the in the true grace of God" (Elliot 1996:173).

3.3.4 1 Peter 3:22

ὅς ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανὸν ὑποταγέντων αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων. (UBS 5)
who is at the right hand of God, having gone into heaven, after angels and authorities and powers had been subjected to Him (NASB)

This context of hypotassō finds itself in 1 Peter 3:18-22, a passage which has "often been called one of the most difficult to understand in the New Testament. Martin Luther himself stated, 'This is a strange text and certainly a more obscure passage than any other passage in the New Testament. I still do not know for sure what the apostle meant'" (Osborne 2011:227). However, the use of hypotassō here is not one of the key problems, as it is found in a common pairing of Psalm 109 (LXX)—the source of "most, if not all" NT references to Christ at the right hand of God (Michaels 1988:219), also the OT passage most quoted in the NT (Osborne 2011:232)--and Psalm 8 (LXX).

Table 3-5

Psalm 8:6	And you appointed him over the works of your hands. You arranged all things under his feet (LES)	**Psalm 109:1**	The Lord spoke to my Lord, “Be seated at my right side until I set your enemies as a footstool for your feet" (LES)

Osborne explains that these references are usually “used to anchor Christ’s authority over all of creation that God has made subject to him” (2011:232). Michaels, while not seeing a direct citation or allusion to Psalm 8:6, concludes that v22 “effectively makes the point that ‘all things’ are now in subjection to the risen Christ in heaven” (1988:220). Osborne recognizes that—based on possible reference of v3:19 to found in 1&2 Enoch, Jubilees, et al.—the “angels, authorities, and powers” are references to Jewish traditions of evil powers having certain authorities, and v22 stands as a Scriptural reminder that Christ “has already won the victory and has absolute power over them. That victory has not yet been finalized, but it is in process; and the Christians can be encouraged and rest assured that this triumph is absolutely certain and that they will share in it” (2011:233).

As previously discussed (see Ephesians 1:22), the associative semantics of victory, complete subjection, and total authority come more from the idiom of “under one’s feet” than the use of hypotassō. In this context, the term denotes the action of God in assigning, positioning, or placing the bespoke powers under Christ’s feet—thus into His rule. Of interesting note is that way that the reality of these authorities’ “subjection” to Christ affects the implementation of the commands to honor, respect, or be subordinate to human institutions. If all authority has been given to Christ—put under His feet—then a human need not fear nor be reticent towards honoring and upholding those same authorities. Or at least, it should be noted, that one can find a way to carefully and responsibly honor Christ through an honorable relationship. By honoring marriage, a wife actually honors Christ. By doing good, even in the face of abusive leadership, a slave can honor Christ. Again, ending a section with the context of honor, Elliot sees this passage as directing the original readers to “see in the suffering and resurrected Christ not only an exemplar but also an enabler of their own vindication” (Elliot 2007:171).

3.3.5 1 Peter 5:5

Ὁμοίως, νεώτεροι, ὑποτάγητε πρεσβυτέροις; πάντες δὲ ἀλλήλοις τὴν ταπεινοφροσύνην ἐγκομβώσασθε, ὅτι Ὁ θεὸς ὑπερηφάνοις ἀντιτάσσεται, ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν. (UBS5)

You younger men, likewise, be subject to your elders; and all of you, clothe yourselves with humility toward one another, for God is opposed to the proud, but gives grace to the humble (NASB)

This context, the last I am scrutinizing at length, takes our discussion in a unique direction. While most deutero-Pauline and pastoral contexts of hypotassō are in household codes or honor discourse discussing social relationships, this one finds itself deeply embedded in the imagery of shepherds. While there is similarity in form and tone to the previous household codes (Michaels 1988:277; Osborne 2011:257), the language being used, and the associated cultural context, references a shepherd's work with flocks, which is "the major image behind the work of 'pastoring' in the New Testament" (Osborne 2011:255). In 1 Peter, Jesus is called shepherd (v2:25), and in this context "Chief Shepherd" (v5:4). The ideology and terminology used of a shepherd leader is well-attested: in the OT describing the relationship between God and His people (Charles 2006:352); in John 10, where Jesus becomes the "good shepherd" (Osborne 2011:255); in Luke/Acts, with instructions to church leaders (Michaels 1988:282); and in the "best known and one of the most appreciated pieces of Old Testament literature ever penned", Psalm 23 (Resane 2014:1)—which opens with the phrase "The LORD is my shepherd, I shall not want" (Psalm 23:1 NASB). While I do not have space to elaborate on shepherd-leadership, the role of hypotassō in this metaphor requires treatment.

First, a couple comments on syntactical issues. In 1 Peter 5:1-5 there is exhortation given to three groups of people: πρεσβύτερος (older ones), νέος (new ones/younger ones), and πᾶς (all). There have been various propositions regarding the identity of "older" and "younger", but Osborne explains (with the support of most commentators), that, due to lack of evidence on the use of νέος, one should base interpretation on the idea that "elders were normally older and more mature in the faith" (2011:254); and, the reference to "new" or "young" ones is best understood "as a convenient reference for the rest of the congregation" (2011:254). Thus, rhetorically; grammatically—through the reciprocal use of ὁμοίως (Michaels 1988:287); and contextually—through the extensive use of shepherding imagery extending through v8 (the devil prowling like a lion); we can connect the imperatives in 1 Peter 5:1-4 with the imperatives and Proverbial citation in 1 Peter 5:5. There is not a

"breakout" in v5 wherein the author starts discussing rebellious teens, or parent/child relationships—more specifically, the author does not turn away from the established context of leaders and followers being addressed as a shepherds and sheep.

Osborne nicely summarizes the thrust of the imagery, explaining,

> *"The idea of Christian leaders as "shepherd/pastor" grew out of John 21:15–17 (cf. Acts 20:28; Eph 4:11). But there is also, in 5:2, an emphasis on the fact that the community is "the flock of God," not the shepherd's. The leaders are responsible to watch God's flock and are watching over it, not controlling it. The charge to "watch over it" (see note on 5:2) refers to both oversight and vigilance. In both Greek and Jewish contexts, the idea was to 'manage' the flock well, to be its guardian (see 2:25) and protect it." (Osborne 2011:255-256)*

Several commentators note on the surprisingly brief imperative for younger ones to be subject to older (Michaels 1988:289), understanding as "just a gentle reminder regards the authority God has given to his chosen leaders" (Osborne 2011:257); or, a seemingly off-topic admonitions regarding social appropriateness (Charles 2006:253); but none of the major commentators interpret the term through the explicated cultural filter of shepherd-leadership. This is especially strange as many commentators make a note of the special and poignant relevance of this passage to the apostle Peter; he, being called by Jesus to specifically feed and tend to His sheep (John 21:15-19; Osborne 2011:255; Michaels 1988:287). In 1 Peter 5:1-5, the personal calling given to Peter is shared with the spiritually mature who are feeding and tending the flocks they have been allotted (v3). Walking in the footsteps of Jesus means to be a shepherd to God's people.

In expanding on the Biblical theme of "shepherd-leaders", Resane[21] goes in-depth as to the various implications of what it means to "ποιμαίνω" ("to serve as a tender of sheep, herd, tend, pasture" [BDAG]). In describing the role of a shepherd, he notes several obligations and expectations of the sheep, who "represented wealth because they provided food (milk); clothing (wool and hides); and shelter (leather for tents)" (Resane 2014:2). Sheep are intrinsically valuable, and it is important for the owner of sheep to find good shepherds who, realizing the value of the sheep, strive to lead, protect, and guard them so that they would continue to provide value. The following is a summary of the characteristics, obligations,

[21] I highly recommend that the reader reads Resane's call for the modern ecclesial community to embrace shepherd leadership, as his application of Biblical shepherding to modern church leadership is compelling.

and expectations of sheep which should inform our understanding of a sheep's role in being led by a shepherd:

1) Sheep wander (Isaiah 53:6), and when they do, they must be able to recognize their shepherd and trust his guidance.
2) Sheep need to trust the provision and care provided them—there is reciprocity here as provision is required for usefulness and increased value.
3) Sheep "possess a strong sense of discernment" (Resane 2014:§Leading) and a caring shepherd learns to harness this so that dangers can be identified through the sheep's behavior. Sheep can be taught "to be vigilant" (Resane 2014:§Protection)
4) A sheep needs to be responsive to the rod & staff in allowing the shepherds guidance, as a fundamental task of a shepherd is to *"guide and direct them to prevent them from wandering off into danger. The most important piece of a shepherd's equipment, besides his rod to protect and defend the sheep, is his staff to guide and direct them. The staff is the ever-present symbol of the shepherd's authority. Its primary purpose is supervising, guiding and directing"* (Resane 2014:§Guidance); the staff enables an active following of the shepherds lead.

So, I do not want to extend the metaphor too far, as I am not expounding on the text, but I did want to make explicit cultural knowledge implicit to 1st century recipients. The language of a shepherd used to extoll the "elders" would have clearly associated the command to hypotassō directed at those "younger" with the actions or behaviors expected of sheep. In this imagery, "it is the focus of doing and living Christ in a mutual interconnectedness that enhances the communion ecclesiology. The shepherd and the sheep (leaders and followers) do life together for the benefit of each other, leading to ecclesia as a desirable incarnation of Christ in the world." (Resane 2014:8).

From the short and simple command for Ὁμοίως, νεώτεροι, ὑποτάγητε πρεσβυτέροις (UBS5), "You younger men, likewise, be subject to your elders" (NASB), the literally pastoral context highlights a few semantic features in this usage—hypotassō:

1) Is associated with the active following (even pursuit) of a shepherd.
2) Refers to the recognition and respect of provision, care, and guidance provided by the one to whom you are assigned (allotted).
3) Refers to a reciprocal, synergetic relationship, wherein one accepts the authority given to a leader and seeks to act in kind with guidance, allow protection, resign oneself to correction, and take on an agreeable demeanor.

This pastoral context lends weight to understanding hypotassō more as “coming under the delegated protection of an authorized caregiver” more than “accepting the authority of a powerful master”.

The author of 1 Peter endcaps this passage with the a command to “all” to “clothe yourself in humility”—a possible reference to Jesus’ washing the disciples feet (Charles 2006:354; Michaels 1988:290); and then a citation of the same Proverb used in James 4 (Prov. 3:34 LXX) stating that “God is opposed to the proud, but gives grace to the humble” (1 Pe. 5:5b NASB). Osborne, quoting Michaels explains,

> *“the humility that should characterize every member (elder and others), [is] in a sense equivalent to the mutual submission of Ephesians 5:21. This humility is horizontal in 5:5b (to each other) and vertical in 5:6 (to God). As Michaels (1988:293) aptly puts it, the whole paragraph is “most appropriately understood as Peter’s exposition of the text of Prov 3:34” (Osborne 2011:259)*

Here again, in the pastoral epistles humility and hypotassō find a common context, one in which explains the choice central to hypotassō—will one choose “self-glory, which will give temporary power but subsequent judgment, or self-humility, which leads to a servant heart and praise from God” (Osborne 2011:92)?

Chapter 4: Understanding the texts in relation to each other

By analysing aspects of the rhetorical and cultural semantics of hypotassō within the deutero-Pauline and catholic letters individually, and by briefly evaluating the paradigmatic relationships therein, several textual and thought-world relationships have been uncovered. Before I turn to evaluating the semantic features of hypotassō, I want to take a closer look at these relationships to see if they add any additional clarification to understanding the denotative and connotative meanings of the term in the late 1st century CE.

4.1 Intertextual perspectives between deutero-Pauline and catholic letters

4.1.1 Differences between Ephesians and 1 Peter

As previously discussed, I find it most likely that Ephesians is later than Colossians, and likely used it as a source, and 1 Peter shows clear reference to Ephesians and Romans. While there are no direct quotations of hypotassō texts across the three epistles, there does seems to be some type of connection. Colossians 3:18 and 1 Peter 3:1 use an imperatival form of the verb in reference to a wife's relationship to her husband, and Ephesians 5:22 infers one. So, there seems to be an implicit reason for this command to be directed towards wives, but the usages of the term hypotassō are not rote copies of each other. While there is continuity in that both corpora use a form of household code to instruct wives (and young ones and slaves in 1 Peter), there is discontinuity in how these codes are applied and in that Ephesians/Colossians predicates its usage of hypotassō on a different LXX text than 1 Peter—the deutero-Pauline associated with Psalm 8:7 LXX, while the catholic letters upon Proverbs 3:34 LXX. Thus, it cannot be simply inferred that hypotassō should be constrained to a singular set of semantic features across the NT (Nida & Lowe 1992:59).

In Ephesians 1/5, hypotassō is primarily used to describe God's ordering of all powers and authority under Christ, and is then used as a part of instructions given to individuals on how to relate to one another in such a way as to become the body of Christ—a body "fitted and held together by what every joint supplies, according to the proper working of each individual part" (Eph 4:16b).

In 1 Peter 2:21-25, the "call" to imitate Christ's behaviors and attitudes towards those who lied to, reviled, caused suffering to Him, is surrounding by codes for individuals to hypotassō to others who do those same evils to them in an effort to "win" them over into the family of

God. Interestingly, these instructions are founded upon Proverbs 3:34 which promises grace (from God) to the humble.

For now, it should be noted that these different usages of hypotassō do not stand at odds with each, nor invalidate each other. It simply shows that the term itself did not only have one contemporary meaning, and it would be a gross oversimplification to correlate these passages as simple copies of each from a shared source or idea. However, the following ideas can be adduced and considered in developing the semantic features for hypotassō:

1) In the deutero-Pauline corpus, hypotassō tends to describe the action of assigning a role (not necessarily a rank) to someone—the power differentials, expected attitudes, and rules of a role can vary and exist outside of the fact that an outside authority is assigning or delegating tasks to different individuals.
2) In the catholic corpus, hypotassō is an expression of humility—it is less a recognition of someone's higher rank and more a denial of self.
3) Neither passivity nor capitulation seem to be required by hypotassō in either corpus. Implicit to hypotassō is a requirement to act in certain ways and take on certain attitudes. This subtle differentiation can be highlighted by comparing the ideas of "submissiveness" with "cooperation".

4.1.2 Establishing and investigating some shared traditions

In evaluating the textual and traditional aspects of both the deutero-Pauline and catholic corpora, one regularly comes across the idea that the authors were synthesizing materials from various traditional sources. Regarding Ephesians, Lincoln notes "lists of virtues and vices (cf. 4:31–32; 5:3, 4; 5:9), and the household code (cf. 5:21–6:9). Jewish Scripture is put to parenetical use also" (1990:xlvii); and noting Kuhn's work, he comments that "that these tapeworm-like sentences, which drag on with loosely strung together clauses, also occur with frequency in the Qumran literature, especially in the Hymns of Thanksgiving, and suggests that their presence in Ephesians is to be explained on the basis of a continuity of tradition" (1990:xlv). James, as previously noted (3.2.1), is dense with prophetic, Scriptural, and traditional materials; Allison describes James 4 as "intertextually rich" (2013:596). 1 Peter clearly references the LXX, but there is also a modern, "lively debate" (Michaels 1988:xlii) regarding the author's use of Gospel tradition, and contains passages that "exhibit a style and structure so distinctive as to suggest other sources beyond the Jewish scriptures and the Gospel tradition" (1988:xlvii).

A positivistic evaluation of the evidence clearly connects the LXX with both corpora, but the hints of other source materials warrant a brief investigation. Hanson, expanding the work of Boismard, evaluates the liturgical nature[22] of Titus and finds a web of connections between 1 Peter, Ephesians, Titus, Colossians, and the LXX (1968:79-89). Though, "it is not possible to trace with certainty an original order in which the various elements held in common by [1 Peter, Ephesians, and Titus]" (1968:87), these elements highlight that liturgy was still being developed in the late 1st century (1968:90), by authors "roughly contemporary" with each other (1968:91), and each author decided to use similar source material, including household codes, differently and according to his own purposes (1968:84). While the view being defended by Hanson—that early baptismal practices shaped the writing of Titus, 1 Peter, and Ephesians—cannot be made absolute, it does highlight an implied context for understanding hypotassō. That these three epistles all have household codes, using hypotassō, textually connected to the concept of baptism (1968:90), and with Ephesian's correlation of a wife's relationship to her husband being a mirror of the church's relationship to Christ[23] (Eph. 5:23-30)—in that the two "become one flesh" (Eph. 5:41; Gen. 2:24); suggest at least some synonymity between the meaning of hypotassō and the expectations expected of a baptized Christian. While a doctrinal exploration of baptism is far outside the scope of this thesis, Stanley, in evaluating the early formation of the sacrament of baptism, explains how baptism signified "admission into the Body of the exalted Christ" (1957:215). In the NT baptism is often discussed as washing or cleansing, and the effects of it are restoration, rebirth, resurrection, empowerment, consecration, and unity (Stanley 1957:200-212). In both corpora being evaluated here, household codes using hypotassō were "associated with the baptismal service" (Hanson 1968:90), and thus the term should be understood in light of what it means to become part of and act as a unified body—a body with Christ as its head.

4.2 Intertextual perspectives on the Septuagint

Both corpora being evaluated here utilize Septuagint citations either including hypotassō or creating a close association with the term. The direct quotes have already been discussed

[22] Hanson's study is centered on baptismal liturgy, but quickly expands to investigate household codes and gospel accounts.
[23] The author of Ephesians claims that husbands ought to love wives as their own bodies, as the church is Christ's own body—quoting Genesis 2:23, that husband and wife become "one flesh" as Christ and the church are mysteriously one flesh.

in context, but I want to take a quick look at the thought world of the LXX regarding hypotassō, as the authors of both corpora were evidentially influenced by the LXX.

4.2.1 General "Hebrew alignment" of hypotassō in the LXX

The following table, taken from the Lexham Analytical Lexicon of the Septuagint (LALS) and "based on the Swete LXX to Lexham Hebrew Bible reverse interlinear" (LALS 2012:§Introduction) texts, aligns LXX uses of hypotassō with Hebrew terms likely to be original (in texts where such a connection can be made), and includes a count of the references where those equivalencies exist; additionally the LALS lists English glosses where the Hebrew alignment cannot be determined:

Table 4-1

Count	Hebrew	Definition / Gloss	Reference
6		subject (mostly used as a gerund)	Wis 8:14; Es B:2; E:3; 3 Mac 1:7; 2:13; Da 11:39v
2	דבר 1	turn one's back, turn aside; drive away; pursue	Ps 17:48; 46:4
2	דמם 1	be motionless, rigid; stand still; keep quiet	Ps 36:7; 61:6
2	רוע	cry, cry out, shout; raise the war-cry or alarm; rejoice, cheer	Ps 59:10; 107:10
1	שית	set, stand, place; ordain, cause to occur	Ps 8:7
1	דּוּמִיָּה	silence, rest	Ps 61:2
1	רדד	drive back, subjugate, conquer; hammer out	Ps 143:2
1	תור	spy out, reconnoiter; seek out, discover; follow	3 Kgdms 10:15
1	כבשׁ	subjugate; violate	1 Ch 22:18
1	נָתְנוּ יָד תַּחַת	"to put a hand under" (NASB)	1 Ch 29:24
1		subordinate	2 Ch 9:14
1	שׂים	lay, set (down), arrange; fix, stand, put, install, mount, establish, confirm	Hag 2:18
1		subdue	Wis 18:22
1		authority	Esther B:1
1		obey	Da 6:13v
1		be under	Da 11:37
1		them	2 Mac 4:12
1		placing under his command	2 Mac 8:9
1		placing under	2 Mac 8:22
1		submit	2 Mac 9:1
1		surrender	2 Mac 13:23

I included the entirety of hypotassō usage in the LXX, and though an evaluation of the diachronic development of the term is not necessary at this time, I think it is important to note, again, the wide range of concepts encompassed by the term—even in time periods closer to its first attested uses. Additionally, there are a few observations I want to note and expand, as they provide insight into the associative semantics of hypotassō.

4.2.1.1 The ruler-subject relationship

In all the contexts being evaluated in this thesis, the only use of hypotassō taken directly from the LXX, in Eph. 1:22, is from Psalm 8:7 LXX, "You (Lord) make him (mankind) to rule over the works of Your hands; You have put all things under his feet" (Ps. 8:7 NASB, clarifications mine). In this verse, hypotassō refers to Yahweh's putting, or subjecting, of all things to mankind (a reference to Genesis 1). Additionally, an investigation of the usages listed in Table 4-1 revealed that 16 of them refer to act of YHWH, a king, or a savior-figure arranging, subduing, ordering, ordaining, or subjecting people or powers. The verb is used as a gerund 4 times to describe people as subjects of a ruler; and an additional 2 usages describe soldiers assigned by an emperor to a military commander. Quantitatively speaking, 22 out of 28 usages of hypotassō are explicitly or implicitly associated with the sovereign-subject relationship. Thus, the question becomes, what does this relationship look like and how would it have been understood by those original recipients of the epistles in question?

First, looking specifically at the quoted Psalm 8 context, Retief notes that,

> *"There are enough synonyms and semantic similarities in all three stanzas to sense that the poem in all its parts is speaking about the same person and issue, namely the question of the quality of the divine representative of YHWH'S rule. However, within the context of joyful worship, this is not only a question in need of an answer but could also indeed be an exclamation of joy and wonder!" (Retief 2014:1000-1001).*

To be explicit, the relationship described as God's delegation of stewardship authority to mankind is a thing to be celebrated. This highlights the royal ideology implicit to the Psalm. Mays highlights that,

> *"royal imagery has another dimension of importance […] in fact, from all we know from the literature of the period, ideal king was one who was expected*

> *to rule for the sake of his subjects […] Power was given to him to provide protection, administer justice, and plan for the prosperity of his people." (2006:104).*

In support of this idea, Carr emphasizes that the royal theologies of Egypt and Mesopotamia had a distinct effect on the writing of the royal psalms, and,

> *"Over and over again the texts of these ancient empires emphasize that it is the king who is authorized to call on God for military help. The king, and the king alone, is authorized by God to ask for and achieve military success for his people, and one of the main jobs of the king in ancient Egyptian and Mesopotamian royal texts is to destroy the people's enemies." (Carr 2010:67)*

Protection was not the only benefit of a divinely authorized ruler; Carr connects the royal theology implicit to these Psalms with the Hebrew concept of tzedakah—usually translated as "righteousness" or "social responsibility" (2010:67)—and explains that "kingship was meant to be an institution through which God provided both protection and care for the most vulnerable of God's people" (2010:69). Furthermore, the ideology of these psalms "are a witness to some of Israel's earliest ideas of power and community" (2010:70).

In studying this relationship of humans to nature represented in Psalm 8, Mngqisia found that the arrangement made by God described in the Psalm is best described as a partnership as:

a) God's creative act presents humanity and nature side-by-side.
b) both partake in God's glory and are to honour Him.
c) "existence depends on the service that they are to give to each other (Ps 8:6; Gen 2:15,19; Ex 23:4, 5; Deut 22:1; 25:4)" (2006:155).

Interesting in Mngqisia's study is the recognition of the natural and implicitly pastoral nature of the ruler-subject relationship found in Psalm 8—in fact, sheep, oxen, and herds are the first animals listed as having been "placed [by The Lord] under mankind's feet" (Ps. 8:7-8). As in 1 Peter 5, hypotassō is used in reference to a sheep's synergetic relationship with its shepherd—which I will expand a bit further in a moment.

In exploring the implicit Psalms 8 ideology of rulership, one can see its implications on what it means to "be a subject". It would seem that hypotassō refers less to *being subjected to an abusive power* and more to *benefitting from the divinely authorized protection and provision offered by a ruler*. This perspective helps explain the "joy and wonder" described

by Retief, and even the earlier noted “optimism towards imperial authority” in 1 Peter and Romans 13. In the exemplar of rulership ideologically provided in the LXX texts, verbal action referred to by hypotassō is most regularly:

1) God’s (or a divine agent’s) actions in arranging, placing, putting, or ordinating people or peoples into the responsibility a ruler who has limited, delegated authority purposed towards protection and care.
2) A state of having been made “a subject” of a ruler, with implications of accepting the ruler’s and one’s own positions and not rebelling against it.

Now, I am not evaluating the reality of rulership in the ancient world, nor attempting to say that this ideal was the realized norm; in the various imperial milieus of the ancient near east one can be sure that any individual reader’s notion of being “a subject” might be vastly different than another’s. However, the term hypotassō is used in idyllically in rulership contexts, and is associated with a mutualistically beneficial, synergetic relationship between a ruler/savior and the people for and to whom God made him responsible.

4.2.1.2 Excursus: Ezekiel’s indictments of shepherds and sheep

To expand on the notion of the mutual responsibilities of a shepherd and his sheep, I want to take a short detour to Ezekiel 34—a scything, metaphoric indictment of shepherd and sheep, given to the Hebrew exiles living in Babylon. The depiction of a ruler as shepherd and the people a herd “is a popular one in ancient texts, and for good reason. In the literature of Egypt and Mesopotamia, the god(s) and/or the ruler is frequently cast in this role. The "shepherd" is supposed to maintain justice and look after the "cattle of the god" (the people).” (Adams 2008:305). So, though the LXX text of Ezekiel does not utilize hypotassō; one does find characterizations of good and bad, sheep and shepherds. As hypotassō does find itself in used in texts describing the relationship between sheep and shepherd elsewhere in the Biblical texts (Psalm 8, 1 Peter 5)—as well as having a usual mode of depicting a subject in the LXX—then Ezekiel 34 is useful for expounding on the thought-world of authors who rely on these texts as Scripture.

Shepherds are chastised for:

Table 4-2

Verse	Admonishment	Metaphoric Implications[24]
2	Not feeding the sheep	Not doing the primary task given by "the Master"
3	Drinking the milk, wearing the wool, eating the meat	Benefitting from what the sheep offer, without doing the prescribed work
4	Did not strengthen the feeble, revive the ill, or bind the crushed	The sheep's owner (master) would tend and mend to the sheep that they might thrive, and absolutely expects the hired shepherd to do the same (v14-15)
5-6	Abandoning the sheep to wild beasts and the wilderness	Dereliction of duties

Sheep are chastised for:

Table 4-3

Verse	Admonishment	Metaphoric Implication[24]
18	Trampling remaining pastures	Hoarding resources and provision for themselves
18	Stirring up drinkable water	Disregarding the needs of other "weaker" sheep
21	Pushing against and butting horns with the faint	Victimizing and abusing the needy ones of the herd

The context for the metaphors in this text is an economic, pastoral framework: the master is the owner of the sheep; who has hired shepherds to tend his flocks; and the sheep, having been delegated into certain shepherds' hands are expected to produce wool, meat, and milk products—Mein comments, "we can be confident that [sheep] were kept for their economic benefits rather than for more selfless motives" (2007:497). Mein compares Ezekiel 34 to herding contracts of the Achaemenid prince Arsham and find there are economic realities underlying the prophecy's metaphors and these "resonances help to emphasize that we are dealing with a three-way relationship between sheep, owner and hired help. In this context, the issues go beyond 'pastoral responsibility' for the sheep's wellbeing and become those of failing to produce the required return on an investment and misappropriation of the owner's property" (2007:498). He further concludes, that "taking seriously the recognition that the shepherds are hirelings changes our understanding of the metaphor slightly but

[24] Implications are generalizations derived from commonalities presented in the Expositor's Bible Commentary (Alexander 2010) and Cornerstone Biblical Commentary (Thompson 2010). The value in these tables is not interpreting the prophecy, so much as establishing the context of the imagery.

significantly, since their care for the flock is not for its own sake but for the sake of its owner YHWH" (2007:502).

In Ezekiel 34, both the shepherds and the sheep are held accountable for the failures perceived by the master, and this "underscore[s] the fact that the exiles as a body could not blame their whole plight on their leaders […] The population as a whole was responsible for significant aspects of their situation" (Thompson 2010:208). This is an important aspect of understanding hypotassō in a context of rulership. Again, this metaphor of rulers as divinely authorized shepherds is found throughout imperial ideology in the ANE[25] (Walton 2009:478-480), and the NT is rife with messianic interpretations of shepherd-related scriptures (Adams 2008:305); thus in the thought-world of "being subjected" or "being a subject", one must consider the sheep-shepherd-owner relationship.

Some important aspects arising from this discussion can be summarized as:

1) That sheep are still culpable for producing value, even when bad shepherds may lead them astray, implies that the primary authority involved into an arrangement signified by hypotassō remains with the one doing the arrangement, the master, and that his authority is not transferred to the shepherd. In fact, it may be better to say that in this relationship arranged by the master, it is not authority that is given, but a task—the task to protect the economic interests of the master by helping the sheep to thrive. Under a shepherd, the sheep are neither relieved of their essential nature to produce value, nor given the freedom to blindly follow. They are to keep the master's interests in focus and not give the shepherd trouble or distract him from accomplishing his task.
2) There is additional perspective for the shepherd, or the one to whom another is assigned. The shepherd is not authorized to do "whatever he wants" with the sheep; and while he may act on behalf of the master to accomplish the task given, ownership of the herd does not pass to him. Worth noting from ancient herding contracts is that a hired shepherd would often be allowed a share of excessive production (Mein 2007:498-499), which created an implicit benefit to doing the work of shepherding well. However, "self-interest would not be justified at the expense of the owner" (Mein 2007:502); and being allocated sheep to care for was a carefully measured and monitored responsibility. Being a shepherd was not about being gifted control of the

[25] Walton provides inscriptional evidence from the Old Babylon Etana legend, the code of Hammurabi, the Kassite period King Kuri-galzu II, Akkadian verb synonymity, Egyptian texts, the Semitic sun-god Shamash, texts on Marduk, and throughout the Hebrew Bible.

sheep, but was an important responsibility, and failure could mean indebtedness or severe punishment.

3) In many of the hypotassō contexts being evaluated—Eph. 5:21 (in the fear of Christ), Col 3:18 (as is fitting in the Lord), 1 Peter 2:13 (for the Lord's sake), 1 Peter 5:5 (for God is…), and Titus 2:5 (so the word of God will not be dishonored)—there is some verbiage that explains the purpose of the "arrangement" or "submission" is not for the benefit of either of the parties being arranged, but for the purposes of the one, or an agent of the one, doing the arrangement.

Again, both sheep and shepherd are held responsible for their roles in producing for the master—interestingly, the sheep are the object of value in the relationship and are purposed for the master's will, and the shepherd's task is to protect and enhance the master's wealth. Speaking to the complexities of shepherd-leadership, Resane succinctly summarizes that "the fundamental maxim is: there is no place whatsoever for egotism in the Lord's work" (2014:6).

4.2.1.3 Paradigmatic relationship with words, vows, and silence

A second observation arising from the Hebrew alignment of hypotassō in the LXX is its association with verbal acts and contracts. Especially interesting to me is that in the LXX Psalms, the Hebrew counterparts to hypotassō are more often associated with shouts or silence than directly with the subjugation (though both associations exist). Also noteworthy is the associations of hypotassō with the verbal agreements of business contracts or allegiances.

Table 4-4

Ref	Hebrew	Interpretation
Ps. 36:7	דמם	Rest
Ps. 61:2	דּוּמִיָּה	Silent waiting
Ps. 61:6	דמם	Silence
Ps. 59:10	רוע	Shout in alarm
Ps. 107:10	רוע	Shout in alarm
2 Kgdms 10:15	תור	Those going about merchant's business
1 Chr. 29:24	נָתְנוּ יָד תַּחַת	Figure of speech to "swear allegiance"
2 Chr. 9:14	n/a	Those going about or sponsoring a merchant's business
Wis. 18:22	n/a	Silenced or subdued by words (referring to oaths and covenants)

2 Mac. 4:12	n/a	Compelling or convincing
2 Mac 13:23	n/a	Surrender (collocated with swearing an oath--ὄμνυμι)

At this point, I simply want to highlight to rhetorical and metaphorical association of hypotassō with what one says—specifically, what one says within a contractual or covenantal relationship. Even the poetic use of hypotassō as silence is in reference to waiting for divine instructions in prayer or supplication. In a fascinating study of the legal nature of contracts in Genesis, Miller discusses the nature of oral contracts, and using Abraham sending of his servant to Aram-naharaim, delves into customary agency contract law. As established in discussing rulership and hypotassō, it seems that some form of agency is very often at play within the relationships established through the denoted action (e.g. Christ as God's agent, military commander as imperial agent, king as divine agent, shepherd as master's agent). Miller argues that, on basis on Genesis texts, the power limits of agency could widely vary (1993:40-41), and discusses the nature of the customary law inherent to the texts,

> *"The agency relationship, moreover, is not conducive to bright-line rules of behavior […] The very nature of an agent-especially an agent exercising broad discretionary powers-is that the agent must be able to act in the principal's best interest." (Miller 1993:41).*

In evaluating the semantics of hypotassō, I have observed something similar—the actions required of one who is hypotassō to another can widely vary from situation to situation. A careful examination of the "good examples" accompanying the relationship in the text is required to understand what hypotassō means. In evaluating what might be timeless principles in the ancient, customary agency, Miller notes,

> *"the servant stands as an epitome of the good agent. He never gives thought to himself, only to his master's interests. Even his prayers are for his master's welfare rather than his own. Although Rebecca's family tries to induce him to forget his duty […], the servant perseveres. He carries out his difficult and delicate mission with consummate skill and outstanding success" (Miller 1993:41).*

In the LXX, hypotassō is used to describe both the words and actions one takes to create contracts, covenants, and allegiances; and also describes the demeanor expected of one

who has been made subordinate to another in a system of rule. The following semantic features can be adduced:

1) There is both explicit and implicit association between the things we say (or don't say) and the relationship formed by an act of hypotassō. Put differently, hypotassō can both denote and connote words, vows, and attitudes.
2) Agency imparted through hypotassō can include much authority, but the agent himself is not free from primary obligation to his principle, nor is the agent's own subduing to be forgotten as he meets, or doesn't meet, his principle's expectations.
3) What one says, and doesn't say, is clearly, and often, in the purview of hypotassō.

4.2.2 The LXX Proverbs and additional perspective on hypotassō as humility

I discussed earlier various ways in which humility and hypotassō are related in James and 1 Peter. At this point, I want to further these thoughts with a couple ideas about James statement to "submit to God". While I noted this statement occurs only once in the NT, and that this imperative is not a direct citation from the LXX, it would be incorrect to assert that there are no similar texts outside of James. The following table shows three LXX contexts with collocations of hypotassō and a deity.

Table 4-5

ID	Text (LIS)	Ref. (LXX)
A	**ὑποτάγηθι** τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ ἱκέτευσον αὐτόν **rest** in the Lord and humbly ask him	Ps. 36:7
B	ὑπέταξεν λαοὺς ἡμῖν, καὶ ἔθνη ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας ἡμῶν He **subdues** peoples for us and nations under our feet	Ps. 46:4
C	Οὐχὶ τῷ θεῷ **ὑποταγήσεται** ἡ ψυχή μου; Will not my soul **be silent** before God?	Ps. 61:2
D	πλὴν τῷ θεῷ **ὑποτάγηθι**, ψυχή μου Nonetheless, my soul is **silenced** before God	Ps. 61:6
E	καὶ **ὑπετάγη** ἡ γῆ ἐναντίον Κυρίου καὶ ἐναντίον λαοῦ αὐτοῦ and the land is **subjugated** before the Lord and before his people	1 Chron. 22:18
F	Δίκαιον ὑποτάσσεσθαι τῷ θεῷ It is right to **submit** to God	2 Mac. 2:12

Noteworthy from Table 4-5 is that the majority of contexts (A, C, D, F) use hypotassō to describe a relationship engaged in humbly. In context F, right after conceding that "it is right to submit to God", Antiochus Epiphanes continues that "no mortal being should think himself

arrogant" (LES). In the thought world of the LXX, to hypotassō to God is to accept His sovereignty and to listen to and wait on him. Contexts B and E use hypotassō to show what happens if you do not. Not to mention that Antiochus previously mentioned statements were as a result of military loss and a horrific disease inflicted upon him by "the all-seeing Lord, the God of Israel" (2 Mac. 9:5 LES). In these contexts, the association with what one says and doesn't say is also reinforced.

Catlin's intertextual analysis of Proverbs 3:34, James, and 1 Peter provides additional perspective. Showing how Proverbs 3 is not necessarily a disparate collection of sayings, but an interrelated whole, he argues that the rhetoric of Prov. 3 is directed at the wealthy (not the humble or poor), and the main point is that the "God who opposes the proud calls the proud to humble themselves" (Catlin 2020:77). Catlin shows that though a clear command is not stated Proverbs 3 (2020:82), the author of James gives a list of them, initiated with the imperative to "submit to God", which "culminate in the command 'humble yourselves' (2020:82) given to those in power. Additionally, the author of 1 Peter broadens the interpretation of Prov. 3:34 and "calls both the leaders and those under the leaders to humility" (2020:83).

Now, even though hypotassō does not appear in the LXX Proverbs, there are some textual and philosophical issues that need to be addressed to help understand the context of humility connected with the verb through the LXX and NT authors. In discussing the realities of a theology of the Septuagint, Cook, evaluating philosophical and textual evidence, states that "it should be clear that the Septuagint of Proverbs is first and foremost a Jewish document" (2020:240) and as such, theological questions need to be "primarily approached from a Judaic perspective" (2020:240). He argues that "the translator was influenced by Greek culture as far as the form is concerned but not concerning the idea world" (2020:236), and this idea is supported by Joosten, who found that while LXX Proverbs is "more oriented toward making the goal text more acceptable in the [Hellenistic] host culture [than the LXX Psalms]" (2016:105), that Proverbs is a continuation from LXX Psalms and that the translator clearly "manifested respect for the unity of the expanding corpus" (2020:107). That hypotassō is used to help explain the LXX Proverbial idea of humility to a late 1st century audience provides an intertextual connection which needs at least a summary investigation.

After an extensive qualitative and quantitative study on the ideology of "humility" found throughout the Hebrew Bible, Dickson & Rosner concluded,

> *"humility, understood as the virtue of lowering oneself before an equal, is simply not present in the scriptures of Israel. Related notions certainly exist:*

> *God's people are often described as 'humiliated' or 'afflicted'; God's love and favour is often said to extend (especially?) to such as these; the notion of 'theological humility', or submission to God, is very frequent; and in the final text studied, a political, if not exactly socio-ethical, 'humility' is said to characterize Zion's future king" (Dickson & Rosner 2004:479).*

In evaluating the language of humility and poverty throughout the Jewish Scriptures, comparing the verbs used regarding humility and poverty, Macaskill found that,

> *"Commonly, the verb is found in reflexive form: people are expected to "humble themselves" or are castigated for their failure to do so, while others are humbled by God. Those who fail to humble themselves are sometimes described as "stiff-necked," an agricultural label that indicates their refusal to yield to the steering hand of the LORD. In fact, the existence of verbs of humility is itself an interesting defining feature of the concept: humility is the condition that obtains in those who have humbled themselves or been humbled, while pride is the condition that obtains in those who have not practiced this verb." (Macaskill 2018:245).*

He also speaks to the difficulty to identify a simple definition for humility, concluding the,

> *"complex notion of humility has different constituent elements that might appear separately or together in […] recognition of our sinfulness and capacity to know things badly or idolatrously, […] the acknowledgement of dependency upon God, and […] a simple willingness to set aside one's own prerogatives in order to pursue the good of others" (Macaskill 2018:251-252).*

Here in this Jewish thought world of humility, one can start to see that God's sovereignty is not simply assumed but is a part of the very framework of a scriptural worldview built on statements of the LXX—a presupposition to any interpretative effort. I want to conclude this section by noting that a more Christianized idea of humility did form in the 1st century and may have been influenced by the hypotassō contexts being analyzed in this thesis. As previously noted, as is evident in the LXX Proverbs, there was a movement within Judaism to present the Jewish religion in an understandable way to a Hellenistic world. Maybe the household codes, to be discussed again shortly, were a part of this movement? It is noteworthy that the author of James, building on the LXX Proverbs, did not couch his humility discussion in such codes; rather he upheld the traditional idea that humility is submission to

the rule of God—and the only power authorized to arrange the nations of the world belonged to YHWH. When looking to understand humility in the LXX, the concept of "pious submission to God" is very well attested (Dickson & Rosner 2004:465), but the idea of "lowering oneself before an equal or lesser […] is nowhere to be found in the canonical scriptures of ancient Israel" (465).

4.3 Implications arising from contemporary cultural sources

No attempt to understand the semantics of a Biblical word in a certain temporal and cultural milieu can be complete without looking for sources and contexts found outside of the text. The problem, though, is associating those external texts with the Biblical autographs. In this thesis, I have bounded my research with a criterion of evidenced textual associations—associations found in a text's citations, metaphoric similarity, rhetorical allusion, and formal elements. This has been done according to Louw & Nida's methodology for investigating NT semantics—more specifically, I have been endeavouring to look deeper into the contextual associative semantics of hypotassō. As there is much dispute on the origins of the deutero-Pauline and catholic epistles, it is difficult to definitively connect non-Biblical texts and inscriptions. This said, arising from the general consensuses already noted, the original recipients of Ephesians, Colossians, 1 Peter, and Titus were ostensibly located in Asia Minor; interestingly, 1 Peter and James are linked by the use of the term διασπορά, which is mostly likely to be understood as referring to Jewish Christians outside of Palestine in Asia Minor and Syria (Davids 1982:64); and both documents are "were given a more-than-local appeal" (Martin 1988:lxxix).

Now, before evaluating a few hypotassō contexts found outside the deutero-Pauline and catholic corpora, I want to propose a perspective argued by Hengel, that it is too,

> *"simple to distinguish between the 'Jewish-Hellenistic' literature of the Diaspora and the 'genuine Jewish' literature of Palestine. Almost all accounts of intertestamental Jewish literature suffer from their desire to make too simple a distinction here. There were connections in all directions, and a constant and lively interchange" (Hengel 1989:26).*

Hengel famously argues that the Greek language and culture had been influential on Judaism for centuries before the time of the early church and that "to some degree the variety of Judaism as a whole, including the Diaspora, was therefore best represented in Jerusalem. People met there from all parts of the Roman empire: Rome, Asia Minor, Antioch

and Egypt (Acts 2.9-11; cf.6.9), but also from Babylonia, Media and Arabia felix." (1989:13); and furthermore, "Between 30 and 50 CE in Jerusalem there was more creativity and there were more intellectual possibilities 'than are dreamed of in our philosophy'" (Hengel 1989:55). Hengel contents that it is most likely that Jesus and Paul came from a "creative middle class", defined as neither "the illiterate proletariat nor from the aristocracy". This social group would have been educated using "the Septuagint and other edifying and entertaining 'Jewish-Greek' literature, but very rarely the Greek classic writers and philosophers in the original" (Hengel 1989:56).

Pitts synthesizes Hengel's work in creating a critical social-history of Christianity's origins, saying of the apostles given voice in the deutero-Pauline and catholic epistles,

> *"Cephas-Peter was not the typical representative of Jewish Christianity, but held a more mediating position and, therefore, was not in significant conflict with Pauline or Gentile Christianity, having observed first hand the liberal attitudes and practices of his master. Nor was James, […] a Jewish Christian radical causing division between Jewish and Gentile Christianity, but was a man who genuinely sought to preserve the unity of the faith. Christianity was not birthed out of the Peter–Paul conflict. The catalyst is found instead in the campaign of the Jewish-Christian "Hellenists" in association with Stephen and the Greek-speaking synagogue in Jerusalem: these were 'the first to translate the Jesus tradition into Greek and at the same time prepared the way for Paul's [missional theology and] preaching of freedom by its criticism of ritual law and cult'" (Pitts 2016:146).*

The "cultic criticism" and sapient epistles coming out of the developing church were written and compiled by a Jewish-Hellenistic incubator consisting of people who were at least loosely familiar with Greek thought and literature—certainly were doing business and interacting within diverse and complex cultural networks—and can be seen as being driven by acts of sociological hybridity. Carr, speaking of the development of the Hebrew canon and LXX explains, "that peoples who must redefine themselves in the wake of oppression often find it helpful to revise and even invert the cultural forms of their former oppressors. Postcolonial theorists refer to this process of adaptation and inversion of oppressors' cultural forms as 'hybridity.' [This concept] is useful in understanding how many biblical texts were formed in relation to non-biblical textual forms" (Carr 2010:142). Interestingly, Hengel also notes Millar's observation that,

> *"One of the most successful achievements of Graeco-Roman civilization was the removal of the memories and identities of the people whom it absorbed. Alone of all the peoples under Roman rule, the Jews not only had a long recorded history but kept it, re-interpreted it and acted on it" (Hengel 1989:19)*

All of this to say, to avoid the pitfalls of over-simplification and with the social perspective offered by Hengel, I will further evaluate the semantics of the household code contexts of hypotassō; wifely exemplars of Sarah (1 Peter) and Porcia (Plutarch's Lives); Harpocratian's notes on the Athenian Constitution; and a 1st century rendition of *The Life of Aesop*.

4.3.1 The contentions over household codes

The extensive academic discussions over the intentions, meaning, and even existence of household codes, or *Haustafeln*, in the deutero-Pauline and catholic epistles have been summarized in many other works, and while I have already provided my own, generalized perspective, I want to now focus less on what they might mean, and more on the nature of the cultural context in which they are found. MacDonald argues that, "recent research on ancient slavery suggests that the household codes need to be read in terms of overlapping categories of identity" (2012:13), noting that inter- and extra-familial relationships were incredibly complicated in the 1st century. She finds that archaeological and inscriptional evidence reveal that an intricately woven tapestry of identity negotiation was being realized by the early church members, and

> *"A thorough understanding of how individuals were subject to overlapping categories of identity and how they, especially as slaves, could live out multiple identities, can help us to appreciate the nature of household code discourse as highly idealized discourse. The household codes […] appear to present clear-cut categories, but this should not be read as straightforward social description. As has long been recognized (e.g., Balch, 1981), household codes reflect the thematic discussions of household management which can be traced to Aristotle's Politics 1.1253b–1260b26 and are found in abundance in Greco-Roman and Jewish literature (e.g., Balch, 1981). That being said, these codes speak to an audience experiencing complex identities and circumstances including the sometimes delicate manoeuvres required simply to attend a gathering. The instructions*

> *subsume groups without breaking down categories; but sometimes slaves are also parents; sometimes children are also slaves. We might consider, for example, the challenges faced by slave women who brought their children to meetings especially if their non-believing 'husbands' were the domestic slaves of non-believers of high social status" (MacDonald 2012:5).*

MacDonald also notes the many similarities of language, form, and theme between the NT, LXX Decalogue, Qumran documents, classical household codes, and in early 1st century writers (even to the church fathers) (2012:3-6). The codes in the deutero-Pauline corpus are associated with the cultural notions of inheritance—and in the catholic epistles sonship to God—this, MacDonald argues, "implies that the recipients of the letter heard messages of liberation that are barely detectable to modern readers. Influenced especially by the political theories of James C. Scott (1990), some commentators have described the Colossian code as a type of 'hidden transcript,' innocuous to outsiders, but ultimately undermining the dominant categories of the slave–master relationship" (2012:6).

In recognizing these complexities and possibilities I am not attempting to simplify the various usages of hypotassō into one shared definition, but I am attempting to highlight that in this formational period of the early church, it seems hypotassō is used to instruct new believers in ways that help them to *navigate* these societal complexities, not simply to reinforce the "legacy of domination which is fundamentally tied to the household codes" (MacDonald 2012:2).

Now, building on the ideology of heirship—thus adoption and sibling-ness; the idea of complex identity negotiation; and the reality that "Believers who heard the household codes would by necessity often be living out multiple identities" (MacDonald 2012:10), deSilva contends that, "In both Ephesians and 1 Peter, then, I find the authors to be introducing far more radical material into their representation of the relationship of husband and wife than the simple, hierarchical model can embrace and embody" (2004:89). Furthermore, in agreeance with Colijn, I, with deSilva,

> *"want to spell out just one of the many implications of their explicit choice of sibling relationships as the model for relationships within the church and the ethos those relationships are to manifest. Both Jewish and Greco-Roman ethicists promoted a well-articulated ideal of philadelphia, the 'love of sisters and brothers.' This 'love' should manifest itself in: cooperation with, rather than competition against, one another; mutual trust, based on the premise that siblings would cooperate with one another for each other's good at all*

> *times; harmony and unity, manifested in the sharing of ideals and the sharing of possessions; a commitment to forgiveness, reconciliation, patience, and hiding one another's shame" (deSilva 2004:89-90).*

Green also weighs in on how to understand hypotassō in this milieu, often arguing that "'to subordinate' is best understood as the negative of 'to withdraw' rather than as an alternative to the exercise of power or defiance. Finding and occupying responsibly one's place in society, and not passive or unreflective subjection, is more to the point" (2007:79). Here, again, the idea of the authority of the one in charge—the one who does the arranging—is an important facet of understanding a relationship built through hypotassō. Green explains of 1 Peter,

> *"Engaging society entails discernment regarding the will of God, how best to put into practice one's primary allegiance to God, and judgments regarding the moral goodness of the one exercising authority provide no basis for retreat from participation. Because in some circles in antiquity slaves were regarded as persons devoid of critical facilities, that Peter addresses slaves at all is significant; that he calls upon them to exercise discernment and moral agency in relation to the will of God is especially suggestive" (Green 2007:80).*

In her insightful analysis of NT household codes, Bauman-Martin also highlights the semantics implicit in the identity of those to whom the hypotassō imperatives are directed. Presuming the Colossians context as the oldest, she evaluates the form, themes, and content from Platonic, Aristotelian, Judaic, and Stoic literature, concluding,

> *"no known ethical text exists outside of the NT that contains all of the characteristics of the earliest Haustafel and that we can say with certainty was the model that the Christians followed in creating their household codes. Instead, the NT household codes seem to be independent variations of a distinct Christian parenetic […] The attitude behind that Christian tradition was derived in the main from Hellenistic Judaism" (Bauman-Martine 2004:263).*

With a focus on the Petrine codes, which moved the discussion out of the aforementioned "Christian household" and into broader society, Bauman-Martine effectively creates and illustrates a perspective based on the realities of being one of the Christian women being addressed and instructed, showing "because of the patriarchal household structure and

because of their nonconforming actions, the slaves and women were participating in two very different systems of authority and were thus forced to negotiate a boundary fraught with conflict" (Bauman-Martine 2004:267). That these slaves and women had converted to Christianity was subversive and highly problematic, but as a part of "God's own people" (1 Peter 2:9), the imperatives given (including hypotassō) "should be understood in this context of nonconformity rather than in a context of assimilation" (Bauman-Martine 2004:268). With this presumption in place, she discusses how hypotassō interacts with slaves and wives, saying (Bauman-Martine 2004:271-273):

1) For slaves, "Clearly, [hypotassethe] here does not mean that they are to submit sexually or to stop their Christian activities so that the suffering would cease; the author insists consistently that the suffering will continue because of their [agathopoiuntas] (doing good). 'Accepting authority' here would then mean that the slaves will not retaliate when punished for their Christian activities".
2) For slaves, as an innocent "Jesus was subject to abuse" so might they be, but submission "indicate[s] speaking with the respect due to those socially in authority during conflicts over Christian activities".
3) To women, "the exhortation to the wives to submit is similar to the exhortation to the slaves; it encourages them to accept their husbands' authority during the persecution that they face as a result of their disobedience".
4) For everyone, Jesus was suffered great abuse, similar to slaves, but "Jesus did not retaliate. This is the key to the interpretation of all of the author's exhortations regarding behavior: the critical choice between doing evil and doing good always centers on the believer's moral stance during and after the experience of suffering".

In this complex system of competing authorities and allegiances, NT authors "unanimously assert that to be a Christian is to suffer", and suffering and martyrdom were to be emulated, as (Bauman-Martine 2004:274-276):

a) endurance in the face of suffering was "an empowering reversal of social constrictions".
b) "Christian sources of the second century insist that the endurance of persecution attracted converts".

Considering all these things, Bauman-Martine concludes,

> *"The Roman method of establishing dominance through force was resisted by Christian endurance of that force: the body, pain, injury, and even death*

> *were signifiers that were reappropriated by some Christian women to mean power rather than defeat and assimilation. Weakness and humiliation on one side of the cultural boundary were reinterpreted as strength and honor on the other" (Bauman-Martine 2004:275-276)*

That the codes are not simply an enforcing of Hellenistic norms is apparent. The nature of the complex social situations which existed within and outside of the church, and the fact the different authors used household codes to address those situations, hints that the codes were an act of hybridity—repackaging Jewish-Hellenistic in an understandable form to the developing church. Understanding the implications of the teaching of each set of household codes is not necessary to continue an evaluation of the semantics of hypotassō, but that the term is used so prevalently in this social context—so fraught with conflict, honor, authority, and identity—demands that an interpreter rely on a nuanced understanding of the word. In-and-of itself, the use of hypotassō does not seem to denote or infer the idea of unqualified or essential submission, but it does seem to involve a range of attitudes and actions that interact with the duty and honor expected within a complex social structure.

Interestingly, while the household codes in 1 Peter are ostensibly more aligned with traditional Jewish materials—through citations and allusions to LXX prophets, Proverbs, Psalms—the *Musar le Mevin*, a "non-Qumranic document found among the Dead Sea Scrolls" (Stuckenbruck 2014:359) shows clear thematic and contextual relationship with Ephesians. While the Ephesians code are structured similar to Colossians, and thus similar in form to the Greco-Roman dyadic tradition, *Musar* offers instructions given directly to the wife; uses terminology regarding dominion and or rulership; connects the marriage relationship to a "mystery"; and importantly, repeatedly correlates marriage to Genesis 2:24. It seems the authors of Ephesians and of the *Musar* are drawing on non-Scriptural traditional Jewish interpretative materials—thus revealing a "blending of cultural mores, socio-religious and socio-political" (Stuckenbruck 2014:360-364)).

The household codes were used by various authors in the developing religion not to simply reinforce Hellenistic social norms, nor to prescribe the classical ethics of the Greco-Roman world as divine; nor were they simply Greek translations of rabbinic Judaism; rather, they were used to convey, or even hide within, transformational and non-conventional elements of Jewish-Hellenistic wisdom. The authors of the deutero-Pauline and catholic epistles needed to use language, and impart wisdom, which would help those early assemblies live according to the righteousness of their new Christian identity while living with, and through,

the overlapping and complex categories of identity existent in the society of Asia Minor during the late 1st century.

When evaluating hypotassō within the NT household codes, Green's conception of "applying the active engagement aspect of subordination" (Lu 2016:13) helps to clarify the denotive and associative semantics:

1) In the deutero-Pauline corpus, hypotassō is used almost exclusively in household codes, and generally seems to associate, through various metaphors, Jewish traditions of kinship, inheritance, and unity with the values of cooperation, harmony, forgiveness, and patience found in the concept of philadelphia.
2) In the catholic epistles, the household codes in 1 Peter use hypotassō to encourage believers in "finding and occupying responsibly one's place in society, not resignation" (Lu 2014:12). One's first responsibility is to God—in the event of abuse and suffering, one can trust God according to the example of Christ and should not retaliate. Instead, the imperative to "honor all" (1 Pet. 2:17) provides a framework for negotiating the web of social relationships and responsibilities, and even those marginalized by society can act honorably and righteously. Lu posits, "the mutuality in the household codes subtly challenged the pervasive cultural values […] The codes not only affirmed […] new identity in the household of God, but also defined a new love relationship for church members as a way to testify to the gospel message" (2014:13).

That women and slaves are given instructions which seem to require them to act above their station speak to the unique character of the NT household codes. That these codes actually created a change in the daily lives of Christian women and initiated a transformation on society is evidenced in history,

> *"By rejecting the major premise of their [kurioi] that force and intimidation should change their behavior and beliefs, the women […] could make at least one part of their lives their own. We do not know how many women took this advice, but as early as 111 C.E., some twenty years after the composition of 1 Peter, we have evidence from the correspondence between Pliny and Trajan that Christian women and men in the same geographical area were willingly enduring suffering and death" (Bauman-Martin 2004:277).*

Whatever our anachronisms regarding the NT household codes, the original recipients found in them encouragement to live a different kind of life than what they were doing before their conversion.

4.3.2 The submission of Porcia and Sarah—a wifely comparison

Now, I should not have to qualify that since their composition, Plutarch's "writings and philosophy have continued to play an important role in Western civilization" including "[offering] insight into the background of many of the New Testament writings. […and…] shedding light on cultural views of marriage" (LBD 2016:§Plutarch). However, the interpretations of Plutarch's views widely vary[26] and span millennia; and, I am not evaluating Plutarch's beliefs about marriage, gender, or society, but what he may have meant when he used hypotassō in his *Conjugalia Praecepta*—advice given to a married couple, and used by modern theologians and scholars as evidence in, sometimes wildly, varying arguments.

Table 4-6

ID	Greek* [Bernarhdarkis 1888]	Translation* [Babbitt 1928]
A **Sec. 33**	**ὑποτάττουσαι** μὲν γὰρ ἑαυτὰς τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἐπαινοῦνται	Rich men and princes by conferring honours on philosophers adorn both themselves and the philosophers ; but, on the other hand, philosophers by paying court to the rich do not enhance the repute of the rich but lower their own. So is it with women also *; if they* ***subordinate*** *themselves to their husbands, they are commended*, but if they want to have control, they cut a sorrier figure than the subjects of their control. And control ought to be exercised by the man over the woman, not as the owner has control of a piece of property, but, as the soul controls the body, by entering into her feelings and being knit to her through goodwill. As, therefore, it is possible to exercise care over the body without being a slave to its pleasures and desires, so it is possible to govern a wife, and at the same time to delight and gratify her.
B **Sec. 46**	ἀλλὰ φαίνεσθαι τοῦ σώματος μὴ βλεπομένου τὸ σῶφρον αὐτῆς καὶ ἴδιον τῷ ἀνδρὶ καὶ **ὑποτεταγμένον** καὶ φιλόστοργον	A woman once said to Philip, who was trying to force her to come to him against her will, 'Let me go. All women are the same when the lights are out.' This is well said as an answer to adulterous and licentious men, but the wedded wife ought especially when the light is out not to be the same as ordinary women, *but, when her body is invisible, her virtue, her* ***exclusive devotion to her husband****, her constancy, and her affection, ought to be most in evidence.*

[26] From Buszard, "Matthew Crawford and Cynthia Patterson admire Plutarch as a creative and independent thinker […] Jo Ann McNamara and Sarah Pomeroy employ him as a mirror of female progress […] a barometer of the social changes of his day; and to Lin Foxhall, Richard Hawley, and Peter Walcot, he is a cultural conservative, preserving antiquated notions of female propriety long after women had escaped the constraints of the Classical period" (2010:112)

**The Greek is only the immediate context of hypotassō, but I provided a translation of each entire section of wisdom for context.*

A brief evaluation of the grammar of hypotassō in these contexts reveals: in A, the present active participial form employs an accusative (ἑαυτὰς) and a dative (τοῖς ἀνδράσιν), implying reflexivity, thus recognizing a wife's will in the matter; in B, the perfect participial is masculine or neutral in form—complicating interpretation further is a text critical issue regarding if the verb is hypotassō or tassō—which suggests that "the body not being seen" (the wife's) has arranged or placed itself, affectionately, in service to the husband. Not to draw too deeply on the euphemism here, but that hypotassō denotes attitudes or actions which actively display detectable affection is clear. Put more simply, the wife's body is not simply submissive, passive, or accepting of the husband's advances, but has shown that they are welcome, mutual, and consented. Additionally, these contexts associate hypotassō with the complex social ideologies of order and honor, and the private world of intimacy and interpersonal relationship.

Context A provides an interesting insight to the interplay of honor and hypotassō. As Eng explains in 1st century culture, "Honour comes in two ways. First, it can be ascribed through one's family […] Ascribed honour is gained passively, and results in socially recognized worth […] Second, it can be achieved through actions that build a good reputation. Thus, achieved honour is gained actively in a public setting" (2019:2). While "subjecting themselves to their husbands" might be seen as the simple acquisition of ascribed honour, the "commending" a wife receives is presented as an active response in the public sphere. It is noteworthy that wives are equated with philosophers—intellectuals famous for competing for honor in the Greek challenge-riposte system—as this strongly infers that the "publicly commendable subjection of self" of a woman to her husband encompasses the actions require to "achieve honor not only by acts of bravery and beneficence, but also by successfully challenging others" (Elliot 1996:168). On the other end of the comparison, the actions of hypotassō cannot include usurping authority or attempting to gain control. So, in an honor-context, subjection need not infer passivity or quietness—to be a subject to a patron is to fight for the honor of which he is an arbiter. To be sure, as previously discussed, the Hellenistic social world was a complex place requiring individuals to engage simultaneously in multiple, overlapping identity negotiations. Interesting also is that Plutarch is not necessarily commanding or prescribing subjection, but rather providing advice to a husband on account of the cultural situation being as it is

Adding to this complexity, Plutarch, while still giving the husband the role of "control", dismisses the concept of wives as chattel, and says this control should be exercised "as the soul controls the body, by entering into her feelings and being knit to her through goodwill". The underlying philosophy, and its discursive nature with Stoicism at the time, is complex; but Nikolaidis, taking an intertextual perspective, contends,

> *"this passage particularly important for two reasons: first, because it shows that it is not only the wife who is required to harmonize herself with her husband's character and wishes; it is also the husband who is here advised to share his wife's feelings and concerns and be inseparably united with her in one entity (cf. 140E, p. 54). Secondly, the husband may govern and lead, but he will not take advantage of this power to promote his own pursuits and interests at the expense of his wife (as a matter of fact, husband and wife should have common pursuits and interests.)" (Nikolaidis 1997:78)*

It becomes clear that Plutarch's ideal of marriage is more complicated than a simple formulation that wives must submit. Furthermore, the advice he is giving is not a description of his underlying beliefs, but praxis based upon them. One must dig deeper, and beyond his friendly advice, to find a clearer picture of what hypotassō means to Plutarch.

Interestingly, in his extensive analysis of Plutarch's writings regarding women and marriage, Nikolaidis discusses the reception of these Marriage Precepts, and makes a pair of acute observations,

> *"No one will deny that Plutarch shared most of the traditional views about women, especially those related to their public image. […] he also valued, as we saw, σωφροσύνη [propriety] as the foremost female virtue and would bestow lavish praise to all its concomitant attributes and manifestations, namely modesty, silence, orderliness, domesticity, submissiveness etc. His difference then from most earlier thinkers lies* ***(a) in that Plutarch does not believe that female nature is a priori inferior to male nature****, and (b) in his sensitive attitudes toward women in general, […] in his sympathy with their weaknesses and admiration of their achievements,* ***in his advocacy for a harmonious marriage relationship to the benefit of both spouses****. Especially on this point, namely […] in the quality of the rapport, which he tries to establish between husband and wife, Plutarch is unique even among his contemporaries" (Nikolaidis 1997:83)*

In discussing the idea that Plutarch believes in superiority based on virtue rather than gender or even role, Nikolaidis references the marriage of Brutus and Porcia's represented in Plutarch's *Lives.* Buszard—noting that "For all their prominence, female speeches in Plutarch have not yet been subjected to systematic study [except one which][27] suggests the possibility of a 'gynaikos logos' in Plutarch" (2010:85)—did such a study and found some enlightening and exemplary implications arising from Porcia's speech acts.

Plutarch's portrayal of Porcia is directly and contextually juxtaposed to Hector and Andromache found in Homer's *Iliad* (Buszard 2010:86); and this relevant, traditional material is summarized by Buszard:

> *"Andromache stands near Hector, weeping, grasps his hand, and begs him not to return to battle, suggesting instead that he remain behind and defend a weak point in the city walls. Moved to tears, Hector nonetheless refuses her plea, appealing to his honor and his responsibility to the city. He sends her back home, urging her not to concern herself with military affairs, and returns to the fight" (Buszard 2010:86).*

In *Lives,* Porcia learns of Brutus' involvement in an ordeal—one that he has kept from her—and this causes her to doubt her own resolve, which she tests by slashing her own thigh. Though she does fall ill, and cause Brutus concern, "[she is satisfied] of her own nobility" (Buszard 2010:86), and when Brutus comes to discuss the situation, she subtly admonishes him, saying,

> *I am Cato's daughter, Brutus, and was not* ***entrusted to your household as concubines are, merely to share your bed and board, but to be your partner in good times and in distress.*** *For your part, our marriage is entirely blameless; yet what proof or favor is there on my part if I share neither your secret ordeal nor a concern that requires trust? I know that female nature seems to lack the strength to endure secret counsel. Surely, Brutus, noble rearing and admirable company contribute something to a strong character. I am both the daughter of Cato and the wife of Brutus. Before I had less trust in these things, but now know that I too am proof against suffering" (Buszard 2010:87).*

[27] "The only comparative analysis I have found is a paper offered by M. Galaz at the Fourth International Congress of the International Plutarch Society, which discusses very briefly the speeches of Porcia and Volumnia in the Lives of Brutus and Coriolanus (2000, 205)" (Buszard 2010:85).

In this speech, Porcia first establishes that she is Brutus' "partner (κοινωνός), not his concubine (αἱ παλλακευόμεναι)"; and the "very fact that [she] must remind [him] of the distinction is itself a reproach" (Buszard 2010:87). Secondly, she employs her "primary rhetorical tactic […] to establish her ability to share in Brutus' troubles, she must confront the presumption that female nature is weak" (Buszard 2010:87). She cleverly undermines the traditional presumption by praising the nobility she has accrued from her lineage from Cato and her marriage to Brutus. To wit Buszard comments, "She apparently knows her husband well, since this argument convinces him immediately: 'Stunned, he stretched up his hands and prayed that the gods might grant him success in his endeavor, that he might seem a husband worthy of Porcia' (Brut. 13.11)" (Buszard 2010:88). Furthermore, Buszard provides insightful analysis helpful in contrasting Andromache to Porcia, and establishing a clearer picture of Plutarch's ideology of marriage:

> *"Porcia's speech reveals her to be more than merely intelligent. She possesses a keen understanding of Brutus' nature and sufficient rhetorical skill to manipulate him, yet she does not exploit her skill to restrict his dangerous activities. She demands only that she be a full partner in his troubles, even if that partnership leads to personal suffering. This is strong evidence of her generous character and civic awareness. She recognizes the impact of political affairs upon her home, but unlike Andromache does not try to limit her husband's actions in defense of the state" (Buszard 2010:88).*

His analysis seems to support Nikolaidis' assessment that behind Plutarch's advice are not only beliefs in the capability of women to possess commendable virtue, but that he idealizes marriage as a mutual partnership. Not only does Porcia declare that she is capable of suffering alongside Brutus in his endeavors, but her conception of marriage is different than the traditional relationship shown by Andromache, and as his partner and companion, she should be trusted and should be participatory in his endeavors, even as proof of her value in the relationship and to gain favor in the eyes of others. That Brutus recognizes her value is noteworthy, and later in the narrative, when someone makes dismissive remarks towards Porcia, Brutus defends her bravery, intellect, and contribution to his efforts saying, "in mind she will be as noble on the fatherland's behalf as we will" (Buszard 2010:86).

A poignant aspect of Buszard's study on women's speech acts in Plutarch is his reasoning that, "Most importantly, all of the speeches would have demanded the close attention of Plutarch's original readers. Greek authors employed speech to reveal the character of the

speaker, a rhetorical practice called ethopoeia. Plutarch's audience was well-schooled in ethopoeia, and he would have expected his direct speeches to receive their careful scrutiny" (Buszard 2010:85). In discussing his readership and his impetus for writing, Stadter presents Plutarch as "a man driven by the need to achieve the philosophic life, and to share it with his friends and readers" (Stadter 2014:50), and concludes that in *Lives*, Plutarch "does not have answers for politicians […] rather he allows his readers to discover fundamental guidelines in the life histories of great men, and invites them to consider the implications of their stories for their own action in the contemporary world" (2014:55). Put simply, Plutarch was contributing to a conversation happening across the Hellenistic world. The discursive nature of his writings should not be lost on us, and given that nature, there is room to evaluate what a contemporary reader would have understood from Plutarch and what that same reader might have understood from reading 1 Peter. That the author of 1 Peter and Plutarch used hypotassō to discuss marriage—a term not found in other contemporary marriage texts—is something worth considering. Does hypotassō refer to a kind of relationship that is markedly different than normative subservience and silence of that time?

In 1 Peter, the author implores his readers to emulate Sarah, the Pentateuchal wife of Abraham, offering her into the conversation as an direct example of hypotassō, saying "just as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord, and you have become her children if you do what is right without being frightened by any fear" (1 Pe. 3:6 NASB). Dinkler, rightly noting that "no text is read independently of the reader's experience of other texts" (Eco in Dinkler 2007:10), provides a broader view of Sarah's submission than the simple use of κύριος in Genesis 18:12—the ostensible allusion from 1 Peter. Building upon the work of Spencer, that Genesis 12:11–20 and 20:6–9 are more useful contexts for understanding 1 Peter's allusion, and Wheaton, that Sarah and Abraham constitute a relevant example for 1st century women, Dinkler concludes that,

> *"Peter presents Sarah as a 'Christ-like example' because she is "willing to suffer vicariously" for her husband. Even when Abraham disobeys God, Sarah obeys Abraham, selflessly offering herself in order (potentially) to save the life of her husband. This is the very task to which Peter calls believing Christian wives" (Dinkler 2007:10).*

Sarah's similarity with Porcia is striking. In pursuing her husband's God-given initiative, Sarah actively participates in the couple's endeavors, even to the point of suffering.

Dinkler also reminds the reader that in these narratives that neither is Abraham a model husband—at one point even giving his notably beautiful wife to Pharaoh (Gen. 12:10-20)—nor does he "[hold] a perpetual superior position over Sarah. Rather, 'Sarah's case was cited in full knowledge of the fact that Abraham pointedly obeyed his wife as often as she obeyed him, once even under God's specific command (Gen. 16:2, 6; 21:11–12)' (Bilezikian in Dinkler 2010:10). As an additional, interesting point of textual interplay, even though 1 Peter 3:6 states that "Sarah obeyed Abraham" (ὑπήκουσεν),

> *"the Septuagint never uses the word hupakouō to describe her. In fact, the only time the word hupakouō is used in relation to Abraham is in Genesis 16:2 (hupakousen), and, there, Abraham is "obeying" Sarah. Thus, Peter's use of the word hupakouō clearly cannot refer to a universal stipulation for wives to 'obey' their husbands as children would their parents or as slaves would their masters" (Dinkler 2010:12).*

In identifying Abraham as her "lord" and throughout a narrative of collaborating towards a common goal, Sarah's relationship to Abraham shows something more complex than simple "submission". What is exemplary in Sarah is her willingness to share in the task given to him by God.

Now, the LXX authors were not writing for the same audience as Plutarch (as they were mostly translating existing work a few hundred years earlier), but it is worth considering that the recipients receiving 1 Peter might have evaluated Sarah's character through what she says (ethopoeia) in the narrative. Sarah has very few speech acts throughout the story, but I want to look at Gen. 18:12, her κύριος statement referenced by 1 Peter 3:6; and also discuss, albeit briefly, some aspects of Sarah and Abraham's marriage recognized 1st century CE authors.

For context, God had previously promised Abraham, and his wife Sarah[28], that he "would become a great nation" (Gen. 12:2)—the implicit expectation was that Abraham would have children (Gen. 15:3)—and this was even further clarified later that Sarah would be the one to bear a child (Gen. 17:15). This latter, clarified promise was again affirmed to Abraham by three travelers, and Sarah was listening "behind the door of the tent" (Gen. 18:10) when the pronouncement was made, and "Sarah laughed in herself, saying, 'Well, it has not yet happened to me up to the present, and my lord is an old man.'" (Gen 18:12 LES). I want to briefly mention two, pertinent observations regarding her speech

[28] I am simply referring to them by their later names, Abraham and Sarah, for brevity.

1) There is no real reference to obedience or submission as such; Dinkler notes, “Abraham is not directing her in any way; he is not even aware that she is there” (2007:10). While the reference to “my lord” does seem to reveal a referential respect towards her husband—this implication being the likely basis for the reference in 1 Peter (Punt 2007:459)—the term is used with a somewhat sardonic incredulity.
2) When the generic promise of nationhood was first clarified as including Sarah, Abraham responded similarly to Sarah: “Abraham fell upon his face and laughed and spoke in his mind, saying, ‘If a son will be born to one a hundred years old, and how will Sarah, who is ninety years old, give birth?’” (Gen. 17:17 LES).

When squeezing out the whole story behind this marriage alluded to as exemplary for hypotassō, what emerges is not a strong masculine man boldly leading his docile wife. Rather, there is a close friendship and comradery in trying out each other’s ideas while they work together in various attempts to realize God’s promises. While this may not be the best place for such introspection—my wife and I have struggled through the various stages of infertility, and do not yet have biological children--I find it somewhat heart-warming that both Sarah and Abraham laughed at each other’s inclusion in the promise. Childlessness is a crucible, and that the two, even incredulously, show similar thought patterns and connectedness, after years of dealing with a shared grief speaks to the high quality of friendship, comradery, and even affection that existed between them.

An earlier episode, premised on the couple’s prolonged childlessness, opens with Sarah saying, “Sarai said to Abram, “Look, the Lord has restrained me from bearing children. Go in, therefore, to my maiden, in order that you may beget children from her” (Gen. 16:2 LES). In trying to enact the promise of a child, Sarah offers her slave girl, Hagar, as a surrogate mother to Abraham (Gen. 16 LXX). After Hagar conceives a child, Sarah “was dishonored in the [her] presence” (Gen. 16:4 LXX), and confronting her husband, she says,

> *“I am being wronged by you. I have given my maiden into your bosom, but when she saw that she was pregnant, I was dishonored before her. May God judge between me and you” (Gen 16:5 LES).*

It should be noted that, “given the social mores of the ancient Near East, Sarai’s suggestion was a perfectly proper and respectable course of action” (Wenham 1994:7); but nonetheless, this part of the narrative has a dark end, as Abraham says, “’Look, your maid is before you; you may use her however is pleasing to you.’ And Sarai maltreated her, and she fled from her presence” (Gen. 16:6 LES). Angel asserts, from a “peshat perspective” (2013:211) and when considering “ancient codes [relevant] to explain the conventions […]

followed" (2013:217), that "the Torah appears to vindicate the behavior of Abraham and Sarah" (2013:216).[29]

Building on this understanding, according to the LXX account, Sarah *says* she offers Hagar to give Abraham an opportunity to see God's promise realized. While some commentators portray that Abraham "was apparently content to wait for the fulfillment of the divine promise in the divine time" (Wenham 1994:12), and then present Sarah as a schemer or as impatient or impulsive, her words tell a different story. After a decade of failure to produce an heir (that they were actively trying is implicit), Sarah humbly offers Abraham a solution, albeit a "human effort" (Sailhamer 2008:175-176). This is a concession, done in response to failure to receive the desired blessing from YWHW—and when the plan unexpectedly results in her being dishonored by Hagar, she first confronts Abraham. Hamilton notes, "Just as Abram gave Sarai to Pharaoh, now Sarai gives Hagar to Abram. Abram the donor becomes Abram the receiver, and Sarai the pawn becomes Sarai the initiator. Hagar has no choice in the matter" (1990:446). Sarah is angry with Abraham and demands justice from God. To have such an emotive response reveals the terrible breach of trust enacted by Abraham in his inactions to honor Sarah for her sacrifice. Abraham concedes this point and ensures that Sarah knows that she still has authority to seek justice according to the same social laws and conventions upon which her plan was based. Hamilton again, "[Sarah] sees her rights as wife and mistress threatened, and the humiliation that accompanies that" (1990:447). There are some interesting similarities with Porcia's speech—Porcia reminded Brutus that she was not a concubine, but a wife should be partner in his endeavors; Sarah accuses Abraham of treating the slave as a wife, and the wife as a slave--even though she was trying to pursue her husband's initiatives (remember, Abraham didn't stop the affair); and not only pursuing his promise, but also according to precedents he set.

I probably should not endeavor a journey into the vast topic of interpreting Sarah, but there are a few salient matters to be considered in relation to the implications of hypotassō. In discussing the appropriation of Sarah narrative in 1 Peter, Punt aptly argues that the author's "reference to a designation used rather offhandedly by Sarah for Abraham became the grounding reason for insisting upon good behaviour from wives, while not challenging their husbands – and as far as religion is concerned, not challenging them verbally – and thereby conforming to the late first-century image of the ideal wife" (Punt 2007:462). Noting that the

[29] However, Angel also reminds the reader that God later blesses Sarah and Hagar, and though "the Torah is not criticizing Sarah, who had acted legally in her context. It is critical of the entire social context of the Mesopotamians" (2013:216).

"figure of Sarah in the Old Testament is hardly one of being constantly submissive" (Punt 2007:460), Punt considers that, "while the letter insists upon the community promoting both Christian identity and cultural affirmation, the author did not uncritically adopt the socio-cultural system as seen in the encouragement to slaves and women to hold onto their faith" and the Sarah becomes "a model of subversive submission" (Punt 2007:463-464).

Punt's assessment provides some important perspective—the "submission" promoted as exemplary in Sarah understood as doing good while not challenging authority; that the author appropriated Sarah's story to "[ground] women's submissiveness in sacred tradition" (2007:460) is a point well-taken. However, texts are not heard in a vacuum, and how might this exemplary use of Sarah be received by those already familiar with a version of Sarah's story?

Niehoff, in discussing Philo's[30] non-allegorical representations of Sarah, asserts that,

> *"Philo accepts Sarah's biblical role as wife, assuming her status to be secondary to that of Abraham. Within this patriarchal structure, however, Philo stresses her significance and idealizes her as an exemplary wife. He especially emphasizes that Sarah did not "shun misadventures ... but accepted her lot. .. with total readiness, as something belonging to and befitting a wedded woman. Philo's exegetical contribution emerges with particular clarity in his use of the term κοινωνός, which he applies to Sarah but never uses in the context of other marriages. The term normally refers in Philo's work to the partnership between priests who perform sacrifices or rulers who share power. […] Philo's Sarah enjoys much more equality than her biblical original. Philo suggests that Sarah perfectly fulfilled her role as wife because she was indeed a true partner of her husband" (Niehoff 2004:420).*

While it would be difficult to substantiate a claim that 1 Peter's readers were well-versed in Philo or Plutarch, I find it interesting that both of these prolific, 1st century authors idealize marriage as something akin to partnership (κοινωνός: one who takes part in something with someone, companion, partner, sharer. [BDAG 2000]). I am not arguing the other extreme, that either author was something like a modern feminist, as they both clearly operate from and promote significant aspects of patriarchy. I am highlighting the fact that there were in actuality prominent voices in the 1st century who defined, albeit circumstantially, marriage

[30] "The most prolific and influential of Alexandrian Jews" (Niehoff 2004:413).

with terminology and ideology different than what is usually assumed as “submission”—and while true equality did not exist, there was something closer to mutuality and reciprocity.

These two authors can be contrasted with Josephus, who “not only [minimizes] Sarah's importance, he even presents her as a potential obstacle to the moral and religious hero, Abraham” (Niehoff 2004:418). It is noteworthy that Sarah appears more than other biblical women in Josephus’ work, and is even given royal attributes (Tervanotko & Uusimäki 2018:133). Josephus tells the tell of Abraham, Sarah, and Pharaoh twice, and in each one focusses on Sarah’s chastity, which differs from Genesis (in that it remains), and “Josephus stresses Sarah’s integrity and thus Abraham’s honour” (Tervanotko & Uusimäki 2018:125). Josephus’ focus on chastity creates an interesting, though not definite, connection with 1 Peter 3:2, wherein the author notes chastity as win-worthy behavior. Tervanotka & Uusimäki also note the Hellenistic direction of Josephus work in that Sarah “is depicted without any trace of assertiveness or independence, which are inappropriate in the Hellenistic portrayal of a woman” (2018:125). Sly, asserting an implicit Hellenism in 1 Peter, reminds her readers that, “Josephus says: ‘Scripture says, 'A woman is inferior to her husband in all things: Let her therefore be obedient (hypoakouetō) to him (Ag. Ap. 2.24 §201)” (Sly 1991:127).

Now, Sly’s study—that Hellenistic men were embarrassed of the Biblical account of Sarah, thus rewrote her—is interesting, and her premise that “Sarah's obedience to Abraham (or vice versa) was a matter of some discussion among biblical commentators in the first century of our era” (1991:126) is an important consideration as “numerous studies show that the prescribed ideal for the good Jewish wife had narrowed over the centuries” (1991:127). One needs to be careful to avoid over-simplifying the idea of a Hellenistic, or Roman, or Greek, or Jewish idea of marriage; and to recognize that a constant cultural conversation was (and is) occurring. By mentioning Sarah, the author of 1 Peter entered a discussion on Jewish identity, the politics of submission, the role of marriage, and the stratification of gender

I cannot divorce the patriarchy or the stratification of gender from the NT texts, nor is that focus of my exploration thus far. However, when looking closely at how Plutarch and Philo idealize partnership and mutuality in marriage, one can see that the conversation was not simply a question of if women should submit or not. Their milieu was complex—incredibly so. Through a deeper exploration of Plutarch—often quoted as supporting and reinforcing the Hellenistic wifely ideal—and a brief comparison with competing understandings of the Sarah narratives—and the flexibility apparent in their interpretation and use—I simply hope to highlight that the imperatives to hypotassō in the NT were not necessarily universal applications of dogmatized and conclusive rhetoric. The intellectuals and philosophers of

that day were wrestling with the implications and effects of the confluence of patriarchal cultures happening beneath their feet. Nikolaidis notes,

> *"Plutarch, therefore, can be faulted for believing that men are as a rule superior to women, but it should not escape us that it is moral or intellectual qualifications and accomplishments that give them that superiority, not their mere gender. It is always this kind of superiority to which he bows, and so in cases where a woman is more virtuous, more experienced, more qualified, in short, a more complete personality than her husband, Plutarch will not hesitate to recommend the husband's subordination to the character and manners of his wife" (Nikolaidis 1997:80).*

Buszard also found that with Plutarch,

> *"Character and context must be borne carefully in mind. Plutarch does allow for a remarkable degree of brilliance and independence in women, but only for certain women, and only in certain situations.[…] First, the motives of these women are uniformly unselfish: they never speak for themselves, but on behalf of their husbands, fathers, brothers, and children. Second, all are members of the elite, […] even queens […] Third, all are beset by extraordinary dangers. Their remarkable behavior is necessitated and excused by the horrific situations threatening them, their families, and their communities. (Buszard 2010:112).*

I find it compelling that by Plutarch's own standards, Sarah displays the requisite traits for exemplarity in leading her husband. She risked her life on her husband's behalf with the Pharaoh and risked her honor with Hagar; she is portrayed as a queenly even by Hellenistic detractors; and she often finds herself in grave danger. In 1 Peter, the reference to Sarah finds itself embedded in a description of hypotassō wherein the author "employs [timaō, "honor," and agapaō, "love"] as synonyms for hupotassō, effectually equating hupotassō with intentionally choosing to respect others by loving them and fearing God" (Dinkler 2007:11).

As I turn to evaluate another unlikely conversation partner in the thought world of Christianity's early development, I want to propose the perspective that hypotassō does not often find itself employed in the divisive language of the oppressor. The term finds itself useful in complex contexts of connectivity, survival, and identity. Punt notes of 1 Peter 3:6, the call for Christian wives to submit "probably entailed a brittle, subversive element within

the traditional household code – along with 1 Pt 3:7's nontraditional appeal to husbands also" (2007:462). There is an ambiguous intricacy implicit in hypotassō which demands a soft touch and careful hand.

4.3.3 Hypotassō in The Life of Aesop (Vita G)

A lemma search for all instances of hypotassō in extant, non-Biblical, literature from the 1st century CE reveals an enigmatic document, the *Vitae Aesopi – Vita G*, quantitatively, as the foremost text to investigate for researching the term's semantic associations—it has 4 usages (highlighting the rarity of the term). This text "offers us a protopicaresque narrative of the comic adventures of an ugly, low-class, non-Greek 'hero' in an apparently colloquial and limited style of koinē Greek" (Kurke 2010:6). Kurke—synthesizing the sporadic and oft-abandoned (2010:26), academic study of this text and its particular tradition[31]—presents the,

> *"Vita G to be a text written or rewritten in the first or second century CE, drawing on a large stock of popular oral tales [by] someone within the system of elite education who feels himself to be low-status or oppressed within that hierarchy [and] is in every respect the antitype to the Greek stylistic standards and values of the Second Sophistic: composed in koinē rather than Atticizing style and diction; almost entirely eschewing syntactic complexity, periodic style, and hypotaxis; and welcoming into the text a profusion of Latin loanwords […] The G author/redactor is consciously flouting and overturning the ideologically loaded, fetishized Hellenism of high-style imperial Greek along with the educational system whose core values it represents." (Kurke 2010:42).*

In a study of Vita G's onomastic features, Kanavou argues that the text and significant portions of its tradition "[have] now been firmly placed in the Orient" (2006:219)—citing socio-historical and linguistic evidence, the text can be reasonably placed in Asia Minor in the 1st-2nd century CE. While some do argue for an Egyptian provenance (Hansen 1998:108;), that the text can be connected intertextually and rhetorically to a much broader tradition is well-acknowledged (Kurke 2010:5-8; Konstantakos 2013:357).

[31] The "Life of Aesop" or "Aesop Romance" generally referred to is known at the Vita W, and has been studied for a couple hundred years. The Vita G was published in 1952 and has been established as a different textual recension (Hansen 1998:106).

While the text is usually classified as “popular literature”, the scholarly consensus is changing based on “Holzberg’s ingenious insights with regard to the plot pattern of the Vita and the structural principles governing its composition” (Konstantakos 2013:356), and the work is categorized with other ancient texts which “highlight the central hero’s cunning through a series of anecdotal incidents, which are rather laxly connected with each other in an episodic narrative; the hero is regularly shown as triumphing over his opponents thanks to his masterly control and adroit manipulation of language” (Konstantakos 2013:358). Interestingly, from a classicist perspective, this puts the Vita G in a category of vitae, romances, comedies, and wisdom literature along with the Biblical Daniel and Tobit (Konstantakos 2013:359). The text’s sapient, didactic, and subversively cynical qualities—rather than the purely “farcical” or comedic—are being uncovered. Kurke promotes Perry’s classification of the Vita G, as being and including fable—which is ontologically,

> *“for the sake of a point that is moral, paraenetic, or personal. Or, as Aelius Theon, the second-century CE author of Progymnasmata, succinctly defines fable, λόγος ψευδὴς εἰκονίζων ἀλήθειαν (‘a fictitious story picturing a truth’)” (Kurke 2010:43).*

Further, again summarizing a large range of research, Kurke argues,

> *“many scholars across a spectrum of approaches have read the figure of Aesop and the text of the Life as satiric or parodic in intent. For some scholars, the object of parody is the pretentions of academic philosophers and rhetors; for others, the arbitrariness and ideological paradoxes of the slave system; still others detect a scathing Cynic critique of all kinds of conventional values.[…] This is Aesop as an ‘ideologeme’ for critique from below, as I have suggested—an alibi for ‘speaking truth to power,’ endlessly available to those who want to assume the mask, however playfully or seriously” (Kurke 2010:40).*

Hansen notes that “running thematically through the life from beginning to end is a confrontation of low culture and high culture, expressed in such ways as a tension between slave and master, vulgarity and refinement, native wit and Greek philosophy, commoner and king” (1998:109); and these juxtapositions are used satirically to “expose the falsehood and arbitrariness of conventional values and assumptions” (Kurke 2010:41). Further, Patterson, quoted from Kurke, sees in these themes an “opposition of appearance and reality” which is a hidden, hermeneutical key useful in seeing the allegories of the tale. Allegories which offer “discursive resources available within conditions of oppression or unequal power

relations" (Kurke 2010:41). Kurke also describes a "form of distinctively Aesopic Sophia that runs as a leitmotif through the text of Vita G: Aesop exhibits an uncanny ability to force his (usually more powerful) opponents to incriminate or bear witness against themselves" (Kurke 2006:24)—in fact, a running theme throughout the entire narrative is Aesop's "unique ability to leverage a hegemonic opponent's will and power in a kind of martial art of the abjected that cunningly turns the social 'weight' of the powerful against themselves" (Kurke 2006:26). The Vita G presents the oppressive, social regimes of 1st century Hellenism as a façade—an illusion that can be dispelled by wisdom of the oppressed and the gifts of a god.

While a full diversion into reader-response criticism of either Aesop or of the NT contexts of hypotassō is well beyond the scope of the thesis, there are some interesting textual and cultural associations which support the proposition that the original recipients of the deutero-Pauline and catholic letters may have found in them content and ideology similar to that of the Vita G the greater Aesopic tradition. The *Acts of Paul*, a text described by Tertullian as having been written in Asia during the 2nd century (EB [2020]:§Acts of Paul), depicts Paul as a short, balding, bow-legged man, with a unibrow (paraphrased from AoP 2:3)—more descriptive than 2 Cor. 10:10's parallel depiction of "unimpressive"—is reminiscent of Aesop's depiction in Vita G. If one evaluates the Pauline tradition taken from the Lukan *Acts of the Apostles* and the later *Acts of Paul*, a narrative comparison with the Vita G is quite striking. Paul, an ugly man, who after an encounter with the divine, travels the world teaching a unique understanding to the people and leaders of the Mediterranean World—much like Aesop. One of the extant episodes in *Acts of Paul* is reminiscent of the Aesopic fable of "Androcles" (EB [2020]:§Acts of Paul). Goodspeed argues that portions of the *AoP* text can be placed even in the first century; furthermore, that this work was singled out by Tertullian, and that it was translated and reproduced into many languages, evidences the text's popularity and saliency in the 1st to 2nd centuries CE (1901:189-190). While Ng argues that the textual evidence cannot substantiate claims that either: later NT letters were used to counter the ideologies in the *AoP*, or, that early forms of *AoP* were considered scripture, she does note the repeated thematic elements which discuss the ostensibly counter-cultural role of women (2004:29). However, It should be noted, that "to say that Thecla's behaviour contravened social conventions does not entail that she thereby revolted against the mores of patriarchalism totally" (Ng 2004:7); and while Ng does not find women's liberation to be the author's intent, "scholars have almost unanimously interpreted Tertullian's words on the [AoP] to mean that he is aware of people actually appealing to the [AoP] in support of women's right to teach and baptize" (Ng 2004:21). A Christian fable, strikingly similar to the

fictitious depiction of truth found in Aesop, was being used by the developing church to contextualize and practice its beliefs.

While textual reliance cannot be proven, that the author(s) of portions of AoP seems to have appropriated aspects of Aesop's character, life, and divine-wisdom-imparting role is evident. Also, that the developing ideologies and characters of early Christianity were being framed into the fable genre is telling. Whether the authors of the NT epistles were combatting or promoting such appropriation is still a matter of much debate, but I think it might be important to look at how the author of Vita G conceptualized social structure, specifically in his use of hypotassō. If there is even a small likelihood that the scathing perception of Hellenistic norm, and hidden subversive parenetic of the Vita G is being alluded to, appropriated, or encoded by the NT authors of the deutero-Pauline or catholic epistles, than an investigation is merited. Furthermore, if the recipients, likewise, had incorporated the Aesopic traditions into their hermeneutic filters, then one must try to understand what they heard in the word hypotassō.

The following table shows three, uncontested contexts with hypotassō from within the Vita G, and one within a variant text.

Table 4-7

Id	Section	Koiné [Perry 1952]	English
A	13.14	νῦν δὲ ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθαι	But now, it is necessary ὑποτάσσεσθαι
B	98.4	ἴδε τίς ἐκώλυσέν με πόλιν ὑποτάξαι, καὶ τέλη λαμβάνειν οὐκ εἴασεν	Behold, this is he who hindered me ὑποτάξαι a city, and collecting taxes
C	102.8	ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ πλείονα μέρη ἕως Ἑλλάδος ὑποτέτακται.	But until the greater part of [Greece/Hellas] ὑποτέτακται.
D*	88a.4	φαῦλος δὲ τοῖς κακῶσιν ὑποτάσσει φρένας	But a wicked man ὑποτάσσει the minds of those who might harm him.

The Vita G is a narrative which incorporates several traditional fables. The narrative nature of the text makes semantic denotation and the paradigmatic relationships easier to analyse—though of course, allegorically, the interpretation becomes quite subjective. At first glance, hypotassō is found in both active (B, D) and middle/passive voice (A, C). This is interesting because the only active use in the deutero-Pauline and catholic epistles is an LXX citation—that the term is contemporaneously used in the active voice is helpful in analyzing its semantics. The term is used twice in a context of tribute and rulership (B, C), and only once does the main character, Aesop, use the term to describe his own actions

(A). Context (D) was found in a text described by Perry as obscure, and Polemis proposes ὑποτάσσει be read as αποτάσσε ([2020]:70)—as it may not be original, I will discuss it only briefly. From the contexts above, we can determine that the action of hypotassō:

1) Is something that an individual has done to them or they can do to/for themselves (A)—this action can be compelled or forced (A), or even deemed necessary. Additionally, it is something that can be stopped or hindered (B).
2) The action, likewise, can be done against regions or people groups (C).
3) While there is not necessarily a need to interpret any negative connotations from the word, the possible collocation with the wicked or lowly engaging in the action is worth some consideration (D).

The limited contexts above do not really highlight the meaning of the word, so I will treat each one in its narrative context.

Context (A) is perhaps the most telling—if not the most semantically flexible. Aesop, a once-mute slave, is working in the field; having recently received the gift of speech from the goddess Isis, he confronts the steward (the head slave), Zenas, on account of his unjust beating of a fellow slave, saying "My good man, why do you so cruelly mistreat and mercilessly beat a man who has done no wrong, though you yourself take every occasion to do wrong and are beaten by no one." (Hansen 1998:114). Fearing that Aesop will report to the master, Zenas acts first and makes a false accusation which results in Zenas obtaining authority, from the master, to sell or kill Aesop. Zenas sends another slave to retrieve Aesop and present him to a slave dealer. When confronted, Aesop demands to know if the summons is given by "the master" or simply "the steward" for "the steward is a slave and is himself consigned to the yoke of servitude" (Hansen 1998:116). Being informed, in frustration, Aesop throws down his mattock and exclaims,

> *"What a wearisome thing it is being a slave to a slave! What's more, it must be evil in the sight of the gods. 'Aesop, lay the table. Aesop, heat the bath. Aesop, feed the livestock.' Anything that's unpleasant or tiresome or painful or menial, that's what Aesop is ordered to do. So I have the power of speech the gods gave me, don't I? The master will come and I'll be right there to accuse this fellow and do him out of his stewardship. But now I must knuckle under. So, lead on, my slave friend." (Hansen 1998:116).*

This rather colloquial, mid-20th century translation (by Daly 1961 in Hansen 1998), renders the phrase *ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθαι* as "I must knuckle down", an English metaphor dating

from 1869 meaning “submit to another’s authority” (OED [2020]:§knuckle); but I do not think this translation really recognizes the full narrative context. The phrase is a concession Aesop is making as a part of his plot to remove an illegitimate steward, and ὑποτάσσεσθαι is juxtaposed with μεταστήσω (remove, depose [BDAG]), and the participle of means κατηγορήσας (speak against, accuse, denounce [LSJ]). At this point in the story, Aesop has already confronted the steward; publicly denounced the steward questioning the legitimacy of his authority; and is planning to accuse him in front of the master to “do him out”. Any silence, submissiveness, or subjection Aesop is planning is simply a pretence for an honor-based challenge-riposte which will end with the steward being fired, and possibly killed—the semantics of hypotassō must allow for subversive intentions, or at least, the term is ambiguous enough to allow such a pretence.

Additionally, the nominative ἀνάγκη with an infinitive, is usually understood as “it is necessary, inevitable, one must” (BDAG). So, what “is necessary” in this situation, and how does that affect our interpretation of Aesop’s hypotassō? Interestingly, Aesop has already been challenging the illegitimate steward, and these actions are not presented as insubordination—the steward had to lie to be given a larger dispensation of authority. In fact, Aesop doesn’t know that the steward has been given this additional authority. In Aesop’s naïve plan, a continuation in his identity as a slave is compulsory if he is to achieve success. However, as Bryant notes,

> *“the bestowal of the ability to speak and to conceive elaborate tales illustrates how Aesop has been interpellated positively as a subject of Isis. Accordingly, Aesop achieves a level of honor that is inconsistent with his legal condition […] Aesop observes Zenas beating several slaves without cause and contends the slave steward’s authority [...] Aesop’s refusal to acknowledge Zenas as a legitimate master makes clear the fact that Aesop is conscious of the ambiguities of slave management. (Bryant 2016:59-60).*

There are subtle semantic implications here. Aesop’s realizes his identity as a slave, and certainly as a slave serving a slave, is only an appearance; his identity of a servant of Isis is the reality. From this dual-perspective, Aesop realizes that he only needs to show respect, not to legitimize the authority given to the unworthy steward. Here the ambiguity of hypotassō can be more clearly seen—in hypotassō is potential for the appearance of submission and the reality of subversion. Ostensibly, the renderings to “knuckle down”, *be submissive*, *to be in subjection*, or to *continue in obedience* can fit for hypotassō; but more accurate might be *to comply*, to give *honor (or pretend at it), to show respect* or *pay respect*,

or even *to be constrained.* I am not proposing that hypotassō *means* to *pretend* at honor or submissiveness; I am proposing that in the middle/passive voice, the term must be understood and translated in such a way that the subject of the verb maintains enough volition to choose the authenticity of their attitude and actions.

An interesting correlation is in Romans 13:5, wherein is also the exact phrase *ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθαι*, "Therefore it is necessary to be in subjection, not only because of wrath, but also for conscience' sake" (Ro. 13:5 NASB). Longenecker notes that the author,

> *"sets out in abbreviated form and somewhat cryptic fashion the two major human factors that must come into play in all the decisions and practices of every believer in Jesus: (1) an evaluation of the situation in which one finds oneself (here, that of rising societal and political turmoil), and (2) the guidance provided by one's own transformed and renewed mind to think and act appropriately" (Longenecker 2016:966)*

Of this verse, Moo suggests that the grammar employed reveals that wrath (or "the fear of the punitive function of secular rules") is only a secondary motivation as compared to conscience, which is "the believer's knowledge of God's will and purposes. […] that secular rulers are appointed by God (v. 1b) and that they function therefore as his servants" (2018:819-820). However, the intended ethic of these necessities is complicated when these so-called servants acts outside of their divine appointment and abuse their subjects.

In fact, this is the exact situation that Roman Christian's found themselves in whilst suffering under "rapacious practices of government officials who were in charge of collecting the city's taxes" (Longenecker 2016:952). These practices were causing great civic unrest for all the populace, and,

> *"It may be conjectured that at least some of the believers in Jesus at Rome were prepared to express their support of such revolutionary thoughts and possible actions on the part of the city's populace by also renouncing their support of Rome's governing authorities and doing so by refusing to pay their assigned taxes, revenues, and tolls. […] Further, it may also be conjectured that [Paul] saw himself contextualizing for his addressees such earlier statements […] 'Do not repay anyone evil for evil. Be careful to do what is right in the eyes of everyone' (12:17); 'If it is possible, as far as it depends on you, live at peace with everyone' (12:18); and 'Do not take*

> *revenge, beloved ones, but leave room for God's wrath' (12:19). (Longenecker 2016:954)*

In expressing ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθαι, the author of Romans was writing to "urge that respect and honour be extended to human governmental authorities generally" (Longenecker 2016:952), so that Christians would not find themselves punished as rebels, but more so that such an attitude should be based on a "transformed mind" which leaves room for God's wrath—as God is the true paterfamilias, emperor, and deity.

Similarly, though imparting more universality to the instructions, Moo defines hypotassō in this context as "to recognize one's subordinate place in a hierarchy, to acknowledge as a general rule that certain people or institutions have authority over us" (2018:814). He does, however, qualify this "subordination" saying,

> *"such a posture will usually demand that we obey what the governing authorities tell us to do. But perhaps our submission to government is compatible with disobedience to government in certain exceptional circumstances. For heading the hierarchy of relations in which Christians find themselves is God; and all subordinate "submissions" must always be measured in relationship to our all-embracing submission to him" (Moo 2018: 814).*

Moo also recognizes a certain ambiguity, or at least thoughtful manoeuvrability as being implicit in hypotassō, and in evaluating one's interpretation and application of this parenetic, he contends,

> *"Balance is needed. On the one hand, we must not obscure the teaching […] in a flood of qualifications. Paul makes clear that government is ordained by God […] On the other hand, we must not […] put government in a position relative to the Christian that only God can hold. Christians should give thanks for government as an institution of God; […] and we should be prepared to follow the orders of our government. But we should also refuse to give to government any absolute rights and should evaluate all its demands in the light of the gospel." (Moo 2018:826).*

So, in this contemporary, NT context, hypotassō denotes the appropriate gratitude given in response to a qualified custodian with limited authority, who is himself subject to a shared higher power. The term implies an obligation to honor and respect and only a general expectation of obedience.

Back to Aesop. Like the Roman Christians, Aesop finds himself being subjected to a custodial stewardship that is acting outside of and in contempt of its mandate. Aesop also finds himself negotiating his situation from a double consciousness: his position within the social structure; and the identity of being a transformed, empowered servant of the divine. In line with the NT advice given to Roman believers, Aesop makes a calculated decision to constrain himself to certain obligations of his slavery in order to leave room for the master to exercise true authority. Aesop cooperates with his fellow slaves rather than rebelling against the system—in doing so, he actually honors and shows more gratitude than the steward deserves, and creates a situation where he is saved from the steward (and that particular master) and begin his upward journey out of slavery.

Now, before moving onto to the next two uses of hypotassō, it is worth noting that even though Aesop does not use the word again, his pattern of behaviour is repeated. Aesop finds himself in the service of a philosopher names Xanthus, and through a series of enlightened, overly-literal, sometimes ridiculous acts of obedience, honour, and humility—read, a continued cunning use of the ambiguities of subjection—he, "clearly makes use of his 'double consciousness' and reclaims an aspect of his identity that has not been crushed. Consequently, Xanthus beings to ignore Aesop's legal condition and treats him as a peer" (Bryant 2016:62). This illumines that Aesop does not regard "submission" as something ontological, but as something contractual. He games the system as it were. To do this, he does not accept the humiliation and submissiveness expected of his station, rather, he acts like a priest from the position of a slave. When Aesop said, *ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθαι*, he was not referring to an act wherein he truly gives any of his will, authority, or identity to those in higher social positions—he does not make himself lower; rather, he recognizes that he and "his betters" are, together, submitted to a divine authority, and connected by mutual obligations. He commits himself into a system which is ambiguous and arbitrary enough for him to subvert and ultimately gain his freedom.

In contexts B and C, hypotassō is used in direct reference to the concept of honor and tribute (φόρος). In (B), King Croesus is recognizing Aesop as the man who prevented him from "subjugating" or "placing into his protection" the city-state of Samos through a demand for tribute (phoros); in (C) the term is used passively of barbarian tribes being annexed to Lycurgus's patrimony through a tribute-awarding riddle system. The clear semantic association of hypotassō with tribute is worth investigating—albeit it briefly; especially as this collocation also exists in Romans 13; and phoros is also the subject which garnered Jesus' famous response, "Then render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God

the things that are God's" (Luke 20:25 NASB); and as Moo notes of taxes, "then, as now, this was the most pervasive and obvious expression of subservience to the state" (2018:810).

In the Vita G, the author is compiling ancient traditions and his presentation of Lycurgus and Croesus is an anachronistic description—this said, the system of tribute described in Vita G is reminiscent of the Hellenistic model more than the Roman. In the Vita G, Croesus extorts the city-state of Samos, demanding tribute by threat of destruction. King Lycurgus, though, is given a more positive treatment, with his kingdom purported to be expanded non-violently (under Aesop's sophic hand). While Hellenistic taxation is a vast topic, Kaye notes that, "Much ink once was spilled on the topic of whether the cities were formally allies of the kings or subjects. Today, a large segment of scholarship has left off such formalism. We tend to see Hellenistic kingdoms as, to borrow a term from historians of early modern European empires, multiscalar monarchies of layered sovereignties" (2018:2). So, the answer to the question, "what did it mean to be subjected?" is necessarily, "It's complicated". Kaye again,

> *"Hellenistic sovereignty (kyreia) was not a principle of exclusive authority on a politically unified, neatly demarcated territory, nor a concept of mutual noninterference between states. Nor was it the absolute, exhaustive property right of an omnipotent king on land and people. Sovereignty in taxation meant control or mastery over specific aspects of producers' economic lives, over aspects of production, and over the appropriation of the all-important surplus" (Kaye 2018:2).*

So, when looking at the use of hypotassō in reference to tribute, taxation, and sovereignty, there again arises a complex ambiguity. However, to be able to evaluate both an active and passive voice usage of hypotassō in a semantic field of the annexation of nations is helpful. In this context, hypotassō does not so much speak to the degree of authority demanded or given, rather it speaks to the act and appearance of connectivity. That one act is extortion and the other honorable, also highlights a certain neutrality in the morality of hypotassō.

In analysing Paul's use of δοῦλος in Romans, Bryant engages the Vita G extensively and concludes,

> *"To contest the ways that dominium ideology facilitated violence required slaves to employ a grammar of resistance that permitted them to subvert the identity that Rome sought to impose on its subjects. […] The Life of Aesop revealed a representation of a slave who possessed the intellectual*

> *prowess to negotiate, and in some ways transcend violence, and subvert how master's understood legal and political definitions of the slave as a subject" (Bryant 2016:76)*

There are a few noteworthy suggestions that arise when thinking about how hypotassō might be employed in such a "grammar of resistance". The rarity of hypotassō in literary sources has already been noted, but I find it especially interesting here. In the Vita G, hypotassō is normally used as a part of the language employed by heads of states to relate to one another in an arena of honor and money. The term is not normally, here or in the other sources being evaluated, a part of the language of oppression or dominance. The ancient legal codes and contemporary Romanized ideology used a plethora of terms used for domination, ontological inferiority, compulsory obedience, and subjection—in Vita G, there is a fable where "the wolves subjugated the sheep" (Hansen 1998:150) employing the term ὑποβάλλω (place under oneself, submit, subject [LSJ]). That Aesop, the lowly slave, himself appropriates a term most comfortable in the context of the allies, associates, mutual sovereignties, and machinations of the elite is important.

By evaluating the *Life of Aesop, Vita G*, a few observations regarding hypotassō can be made:

1) The term is not used of the placement of a person into slavery or used in any context which denotes a person's ontological or societal position; rather the term finds itself used to describe relationships with implicit obligations.
2) The term is used to describes complex, mutual, interconnected relationships; not simple, one-sided identity negotiations—and often these relationships are between individuals or authorities who are rulers in their own right.
3) The term does not ever require an unqualified submission to another's authority; and also, is not ever presented as removing one's volition as a result of the action.
4) The action of the verb can be explained as the intentional creation of a bond; the nature of the bond and its resultant obligations are not directly implied by the verb, but by the context. That the bond implies obligations is certain, but within the new structure being ordered, obligations to the one creating the bond are prioritized over the responsibilities the constituents might have to one another.

Simply put, hypotassō is primarily a word of obligation not ontology. Aesop is able to rise out of his position—the categorization, marginalization, and dehumanization of traditional society—by forging and forcing honor-bound connections with those who seek to sever it.

4.3.4 Insights from inscriptions, legal code, and papyri

As I go into the last section exploring the contextual thought-worlds intertextually associated with hypotassō, I feel that I need to refocus the discussion onto semantics. While the concluding chapter is given in a more distinctly linguistic tone, now is an apt time to note the polysemy of words—and with the semantic multivalence of hypotassō established, it is time to consider what was "the meaning *most* people will think of first when the word is heard"; and this "will be the one that is most 'natural,' or 'normal,' or 'general' to [an] individual" (Louw 1982:34). A brief analysis of contexts of hypotassō found in the papyri and a 1st century legal code will not only highlight that hypotassō has different meanings in different situations, but that the term is not normally denotive of submission, but rather connection.

4.3.4.1 Hypotassō in the papyri

The papyri "were written at the time of the New Testament, and touched upon all aspects of life, comprising everyday private letters from ordinary people, contracts of marriage and divorce, tax papers, official decrees, birth and death notices, and business documents" (Nyland 2003:3). Nyland laments that though "several thousand inscriptions come to light each year" (2003:3), and though they have "prompted numerous academic papers and technical books, they have been largely overlooked by Bible translators. The layperson is unaware of the scholarship, tucked away as it is in technical journals" (Nyland 2003:3). As previously noted, while lexicons which incorporate the papyri include a much broader semantic range for hypotassō, an assessment of its contexts in newer, English-language Bible translations and commentary substantiates Nyland's claim (a comparison of all NT hypotassō contexts from major, English translations is included as Appendix I). If there is anything to be learned about hypotassō from the papyri, it is not included in the modern church's authoritative texts—or at least there is resistance to its incorporation. Further investigation on how to bridge the gap between academia and the church—especially regarding how its members understand the words of its own Scriptures—is absolutely necessary, but this is a discussion that must be left for other studies.

Nyland argues, "While the word hupotasso was rare in literature, it was a very common word in the papyri" (2003:6). She found the term "occurs commonly in the postal documents, with

the semantic range of 'support,' 'append,' and 'uphold'" and in a magical text as "attach" (2003:6)[32]. Of particular note, the hypotassō use in the magical text says,

> *"I have Ptolemais herself whom Aias bore, the daughter of Horigenes, attached to me for the rest of my life, loving me, desiring me, telling me her thoughts" (translation Nyland 2003:6).*

While the spell described is horrific and abusive for Ptolemais, the nature of the resulting attachment (hypotassō) is described through collocations with love, desire, and intimacy.

In comparing marriage contracts found in the papyri with Plutarch and Paul—specifically looking at issues of sexual fidelity—Peterman determined that while "Literary and non-literary sources concur in describing a sexual double standard in first-century Roman marriage", in Pauline texts "Husband and wife are on equal levels: each one has sexual authority over the other" (1999:171-172). The rules and expectations of "Christian" marriage is different than those outside the growing church.

Rupprecht, comparing facets of obligation and social expectation in the Greek papyri, notes that "the particular and far-reaching advantages of papyrology and its source material, compared to other sources, is the fact that, on the one hand, the canon of sources is not definitive and new texts keep emerging, and on the other hand to some extent the *realia* can be gleaned from the documents" (1998:60). Rupprecht discusses his "[surprise] by the business-like description of divorce" (1998:69), and also notes"

> *"That different demands are made on the two sexes is to be taken for granted in antiquity, as is the fact that stricter rules were made for the wife. It would be more interesting to find out whether behind the imposition of strict rules of conduct on the husband there lurks a new trend reacting to what was acceptable" (Rupprecht 1998:67).*

Though I am speaking broadly, the papyri show a generalized tightening of expectations for a man in marriage moving from Ptolemaic into Roman times. It is thus interesting that Peterman noted that such a transformation is evident in NT writing and seems to have been enacted in the church. In discussing the implications of the papyri on understanding marriage in early Christianity, Llewelyn reports a similar trend, specifically under the Roman influence on marriage,

[32] Texts used as evidence: P.Oxy. 1.67, "supporting"; P.Oxy I.34, "append"; BIAO 76, "attached".

> *"increasingly marriage became an agreement between the spouses. Whereas the family's κύριος once had control over the arrangements and conditions of marriage, this now gave way to a joint participation of the intending spouses with or without the involvement of their respective κύριοι. […] the husband's legal relationship to his wife (i.e. his status as κύριος) was now conceived to be one of guardianship" (Llewelyn 1992:2).*

In evaluating the "evolving nature of […] marriage and the influence of parallel legal traditions and social custom" (1992:12) in antiquity, Llewelyn also notes an interesting shift in language regarding Jewish tradition, importantly, "betrothal became more an agreement between [the groom and bridge]", and that while "the OT [concept] of 'acquisition' described the husband's function in marriage", in NT times, "the term qidesh ('set apart') was used of betrothal and marriage" (Llewelyn 1992:12-14). Now, I am not trying to oversimply the complex sociality of 1st century Hellenism, but I do want to make a couple observations:

1) There was a general movement, across cultures—notably Roman and Jewish—for a wife to be seen not as her husband's chattel or property, but as maintaining a connection to her family—namely and usually her father (Llewelyn 1992:12-13). To argue for understanding hypotassō as submission, is to argue that the NT authors were teaching an anachronistic ideal of marriage, not a contemporary one. With a husband's role redefined as "guardianship" and a wife's connection to her father maintained, there is new element of dual, mutual answerability to the wife's father. In early Christianity, the idea of God as paterfamilias (Eph. 3:15; Osiek 1996:20-21) would have affected one's idea of who has authority or rules in a marriage. To this point, it is extremely noteworthy that, based on the papyrological evidence, "in both marriage and divorce it may generally be assumed that the paterfamilias respected the wishes of the woman" (Llewelyn 1992:14).
2) The increasing mutuality and reciprocity reported in marriage contracts reveals a changing ideology and conception of marriage. In Jewish circles, marriage became a covenant not a sale; in Greco-Roman ideology a woman could "own and manage property independent of her husband" (Llewelyn 1992:14-15), and importantly, the changing nature of "good-conduct clauses" from Ptolemaic to Roman marriage contracts show "mutual duties of husband and wife" (Rupprecht 1998:63-67). Interestingly, the earlier contracts impart a customary regional traditionalism, while the later simply establish rights and obligations (Rupprecht 1998:75).

Rupprecht found that “People would choose to divorce without invoking the sanctions mentioned in the marriage contracts” (1998:76), noting,

> *“That violation of marital obligations by either one of the married partners did not make him or her realize their — abstract — pecuniary claims is all too understandable in view of the crowded living conditions, and the social control and consideration for one’s reputation which they entailed” (Rupprecht 1998:75).*

That one might sacrifice rightful monetary gain in the combative pursuit of reputation reveals a clear associate between marriage and honor.

Though risking an *argumentum ex silentio*, it is noteworthy that in the extant papyri, hypotassō is not found as a normative term for marriage (nor slavery for that matter). Lexically speaking, in the published papyri, the word is simply not attested to in the language of marriage. Since marriage is not a semantic context which requires a certain interpretation of hypotassō, then there is room to evaluate if NT authors were using the term to reinforce Hellenistic ideals or add something distinct and different into the Christian household?

If it is true that the papyri give us a closer look at the *realia* of marriage in the 1st century, Greco-Roman world, then it is better to apply the context of marriage thus divulged towards understanding hypotassō rather than inflicting upon marriage—or family, or the church—an anachronistic definition of the word. In discussing the development of various aspects of family and society in the 1st century, Osiek notes of the developing Christian traditions,

> *“Each tradition, each in a different way, issued a challenge to widen one's perspective, to go beyond the narrow expectations of family for the sake of a greater mission. Seen this way, the early Christian agenda did set out to undermine the foundations of society and create a new social order of wider horizons.” (Osiek 1996:24)*

That the picture of marriage revealed in the papyri differs from what arises when one interprets hypotassō as “submission” in the NT household codes suggests that we have missed the reason *that* term was selected by the authors. Hypotassō was understood by the early church in a way which widened perspective, not subordinating it, and there may be value to investigate why.

The papyri have proven capable of expanding and shifting the semantics of hypotassō:

1) In the papyri, hypotassō primarily refers to the authorized attachment of two things—it may be worthwhile to note that when one "attaches" a testimony to an accusation, though the attachment is subsumed in name, its content now shares authority and value as a unified whole.
2) That marriage might have been conceptualized as more mutual, reciprocal, and as creating dual responsibility to a paterfamilias should be considered when evaluating hypotassō in household code imperatives.
3) The presence of hypotassō in family context in the NT, and that a change in Christian behavior has been noted, infers that the authors were adding something to an ongoing conversation, not simply acculturating their readers.

4.3.4.2 hypotassō in Harpocration's notes on the Athenian Constitution

As has been mentioned, hypotassō is a rare word, especially in extant 1st century literature—this said, it does make an appearance in Harpocratian's *Lexicon of the Ten Orators*—a work which "contains […] notes on well-known events and persons mentioned by the orators, and explanations of legal and commercial expressions. As nearly all the lexicons to the Greek orators have been lost, [it] is especially valuable […] and contains contributions to the history of Attic oratory and Greek literature generally" (EB1911:§Harpocratian, Valerius). Harpocration's use of hypotassō is very interesting, and while it is only one context (which in-and-of-itself is interesting), it highlights some important, underlying semantics of the term.

In defining Φύλαρχος (phylarch), Harpocration references Aristotle's *Athenian Constitution*, and says,

Table 4-8

φύλαρχός ἐστιν ὁ κατὰ φυλὴν ἑκάστην τοῦ ἱππικοῦ ἄρχων, **ὑποτεταγμένος** δὲ τῷ ἱππάρχῳ (Dindorf 1853:§Φ30.2).
[a] phylarch is the commander of each tribe's horsemen (calvary), and **ὑποτεταγμένος** to a hipparch. (translation mine)

In this context, hypotassō is a perfect, middle/passive, participle and describes how the relationship between a calvary commander and, ostensibly, his commanding officer. Note, the term is describing some type of relationship existing between commanders, not soldiers and their commanders. If we explore the descriptions of these ranks and their relationships, we can learn something of the nature and meaning of hypotassō.

Harpocration refers to the Athenian Constitution, wherein the following, pertinent description of these ranks can be found,

> *"There should be a Council, holding office for a year, consisting of men over thirty years of age, serving without pay. To this body should belong the Generals, the nine Archons, the Amphictyonic Registrar (Hieromnemon), the Taxiarchs, the Hipparchs, the Phylarch, the commanders of garrisons, the Treasurers of Athena and the other gods, ten in number, the Hellenic Treasurers (Hellenotamiae), the Treasurers of the other non-sacred moneys, to the number of twenty, the ten Commissioners of Sacrifices (Hieropoei), and the ten Superintendents of the mysteries. All these were to be appointed by the Council from a larger number of selected candidates […] The generals should be provisionally elected from the whole body of the Five Thousand, but so soon as the Council came into existence it was to hold an examination of military equipments, and thereon elect ten persons, together with a secretary, and the persons thus elected should hold office during the coming year with full powers, and should have the right, whenever they desired it, of joining in the deliberations of the Council. The Five thousand was also to elect a single Hipparch and ten Phylarchs […]" (Kenyon 1920:§2.30-31).*

No further description of the duties of the two roles exist in the Ath. Const., but a few things should be noted about this arrangement of roles and troops: the "ranks" are elected by a governing body, and both the Hipparch (associated with being a secretary), and the Phylarch (an elected person) are answerable to the body corporate and have the rights to engage in the deliberations of leadership. Xenophon provides a whole text to discussing "The Duties of a Hipparch" in Athens, and from it one finds a complete description of the relationship and duties of phlyarchs and hipparchs. I will highlight the most germane points but have included all the discourse related the phylarchs in Appendix II.

To be sure, this document describes hipparchs as the "patrons" of a joint cavalry, but the tasks they are given are first to care for the animals, then train the men in order to ensure honourable performance in combat and in public parade. The phylarchs are "associated" with him to be "coadjutors" in the "superintendence of the cavalry". They are called to share the hipparch's "enthusiasm for honour", and to be his voice of authority to the men, and his ambassadors to the senate. The phylarch's are expected to embody the dignity of the hipparch and be examples of good conduct and battlefield prowess to the men. A fascinating

aspect of the relationship between hipparch, phylarch, and their men is found in the statement that phylarchs should be,

> *"persuaded that from the public point of view the splendid appearance of their squadrons will confer a title to distinction far higher than that of any personal equipment. Nor is it reasonable to suppose that they will be deaf to such an argument, since the very desire to hold the office of phylarch itself proclaims a soul alive to honour and ambition" (Dakyns 1998).*

Noteworthy is that the hipparch's interact with phylarch's as equals, persuading them not commanding; also, the idea that the quality of hipparch's patronage is seen in the presentation of the men, not of the personal appearance of the phylarch reveals the mutuality and reciprocity inferred in the co-commander relationship. Finally, this statement highlights that a phylarch is not so much submitted or subjected to the hipparch, rather, the phylarch recognizes that actively joining in with and supporting a hipparch's leadership is a way to pursue their own interest in honour.

While the one context of hypotassō found in Harpocration's work cannot be used as evidence that the term only has one meaning or should always be taken in the same sense, there are important semantic conclusions that can be drawn:

1) The one extant, late 1st century lexicon usage of hypotassō shows the term used in a military context. However, the term is not used to describe the relationship between soldiers and their commanders, but rather an association created between co-leaders. The patron (hipparch) needs help from those who have been "associated" with him. This association is described as a sharing of authority, task, and reputation. While the hipparch is given, by a council, primary responsibility for the calvary, the phylarchs associated with him, by a council, share his authority, are his representatives, and are exemplars to the men.
2) In Harpocration, the normal term used for the expectations of greater/lesser relationships is obedience (hupakouō) not "attachment"/"association" (hypotassō). That a teacher and grammarian of the 1st/2nd century CE differentiated between the terms is important.
3) In this context, the form ὑποτεταγμένος seems to imply a passive voice, not a middle one. The phylarchs are associated or connected to the hipparch's by the council—not themselves nor the hipparch. Though there seems to be a requisite desire to be considered for election, the relationship between hipparch and phylarch is created, sanctioned, enforced, and answerable to the council.

4) Most importantly, though the term is found in a “military” context, the relationship created by ὑποτεταγμένος (hypotassō) is no way marked by humiliation, domination, passivity, and certainly not unqualified submission or obedience. In this context, the action of hypotassō creates a unified identity of leadership. The patron (hipparch) in this body is the focal point of identification, the model of dignity, and the primary recipient of the honour and reprimand; but those attached to him via hypotassō are not only instrumental in him achieving the honor, but are included in leadership; full representatives to the governing authority; and are the exemplified presence of moral guardianship to the men.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

> *It goes without saying that outsiders will sometimes have to work very hard to interpret insider discourse (especially nonverbal discourse), since insiders rarely need to make subtexts explicit. (Crook 2009:596).*

Instead of a summary conclusion of my previous discussions, I want to end by explicating certain subtexts—which came to light throughout our investigation—that may elude the hermeneutic endeavours of a modern interpreter. Hypotassō—a term with intrinsic insider meaning to the honour-shame, collectivistic cultures intersecting in the early church (Crook 598-599)—has been translated into modern individualistic, English-speaking cultures as denoting subjection and submission—two concepts which were conceptualized differently in the 1st century than they are now.

5.1 Hypotassō in a collectivistic, honour-shame culture

I have already touched upon the honour-shame culture of the 1st century CE, Mediterranean world; and the concluding remarks of this thesis are hardly the place for a diversion into the sociolinguistics of honour. However, in his much-quoted presentation of the various, historical modes of honor, Pitt-Rivers explains that the word *honor,* "first applied to grants of land or the privilege of levying taxes ceded by a sovereign to his eminent servants and supporters" (1968:§Honor as precedence)—which presents a fascinating association between the "ceding of privileges to eminent servants" and "putting of all things under his feet" (Eph. 1:22). Now, I'm not going to engage in a dual etymological fallacy, but that *honor* and *submission* go hand-in-hand, can be further established.

Now, I do not need to define honor, nor will I discuss the modes of honor which may have been invoked by the authors and recipients of the NT texts—but it is important to note some assertions of Crook, made while building upon Malina's famous model of honor in the New Testament world,

> *"That honor and shame were and (for the most part) remain pivotal cultural values in the Mediterranean is really beyond question. […] An honor culture is defined by the seriousness with which the people who inhabit it protect their honor and fight to retrieve it if it has been lost. This phenomenon can exist only in concert with the perception that access to honor is limited.[…] a non-honor and shame culture might well know honor and shame, but it*

> *does not see honor as a limited good and thus does not contest it with the same intensity." (Crook 2009:593).*

Now, this exploration of the contexts hypotassō, has been fraught with paradox, qualification, and complexity. There is an ostensible ambiguity to understanding the limits and practice of "submission" which seems to leave too much room for faithful interpretation. Throughout this analysis, it has become clear that ultimate authority lies outside of the relationship created by the verbal event. Put differently, the one doing the placing/arranging/submitting is the source of authority—while some tasks, responsibilities, or authority may be delegated is implied, but the transfer of authority is never absolute. Even if authority is delegated, it is limited in scope; and the submission expected is thus limited as well. This is evidenced the concepts of divine authorization of rule; shepherd-leadership; of mutuality and reciprocity in household relationships; stewardship and agency; and in the simple expression to "submit to God".

Now, hidden in the BDAG's lexical entry for hypotassō, and expanding on the glosses "subject oneself, be subjected or subordinated", is the following clarification:

> *"[…] involving recognition of an ordered structure, with dative of the entity to whom/which appropriate respect is shown" (BDAG 2000:1042).*

Based on this clarification, the most basic sense of hypotassō is the recognition that one has been given a position with an established order, and the position comes with an expectation to show appropriate respect to a designated entity. A few comments:

1) A show of respect to a designated identity is the minimum, explicit qualification of "being made a subject". The nature of the relationship beyond esteem is implied by the nature of the "ordered structure", which, in turn, serves as the context for the relationship.
2) The entity to be respected is not necessarily, and often is not, the authority legitimizing the ordering. This has a couple important implications: at least some mutuality or reciprocity is inferred, or at least a joint obligation to the authority behind the "ordered structure". Additionally, the "appropriateness" of respect is determined by the authority of the structure, not its recipient.
3) The nature of the "ordered structure" is not specified, other than the implication that it was ordered in such a way for some purpose—the implication is that the structure serves the purpose of the entity that created it, not necessarily the purposes of the ones made subject to it.

4) Being a subject does not entail being compelled, forced, or abused—just the creation of connection based on an expected payment of respect.
5) Both entities being acted upon are held responsible by the "ordered structure" itself. While there is a precedence established—towards the one to be respected—the net effect of being made a subject is a recognized obligement to respect an associated entity.

Now, moving beyond these general concessions—"Malina claimed that concerns of honor and shame are to be found where authority, gender status, and respect intersect" (Crook 2009:592), and that hypotassō most often finds itself used in just such contexts, evidences a strong association between hypotassō and honor. Pitt-Rivers asserts,

> *"honor felt becomes honor claimed, and honor claimed becomes honor paid. The payment of honor involves the expression of respect which is due to a person either by virtue of his role on a particular occasion, as when a guest is honored in accordance with the laws of hospitality, or by virtue of his status or rank […] Honor is also exchanged in mutual recognition: in salutations and the return of invitations and favors." (Pitt-Rivers 1968).*

Building upon this perspective, and synthesizing into this discussion the collectivism inherent to NT culture—Crook summarizes,

> *"Social scientists have long distinguished individualistic from collectivistic cultures, and the ancient Mediterranean was definitely collectivistic. […] Collectivistic people tend to be governed less by individual desires than by communal expectations. […] In defining honor, we should not start with a focus on the individual. We should, rather, start with the focus on the collectivistic and relentless [public court of reputation]) (Crook 2009:598).*

Now, in describing the features of honor systems employed by collectivistic cultures, Pitt-Rivers explains that 'the group possesses collective honor, in which the individual members participate. It affects their honor and is affected by their behaviour. The honor of a collectivity is vested in its head and in symbolic representations"; and he also asserts that "family and nation are the most fundamental of these collectivities" (1968: §Collective Honor)). I find it interesting that the majority of hypotassō contexts in the NT and LXX are directly associated with either household (family) or nation (ruler-subject).

With cultural collectivism in mind, and considering that hypotassō primarily associates individuals by obligating them to a shared, designated entity—a head; it seems reasonable

that the most basic understanding of being subjected would be “being subjected together”. Put differently, the practical effect of “submission” was to create a more honourable, more functional, more enduring unity—a solidarity. A group of people arranged into an “ordered structure”, bound together by an obligation to respect a shared head—be it a person or organization—constitute a new identity. As Pitt-Rivers explains,

> *“He who admits his inferiority and accepts patronage is not dishonored by attaching himself to a superior. On the contrary, his honor is enhanced by participating, through this attachment, in his patron's honor. The honor of a patron is equally enhanced by the possession of clients; he gains prestige in return for the protection that he affords to those who recognize his power” (1968:§Honor and social status).*

Therein lies the essential difference between submission as “giving up one’s one authority” and “participation in joint honor”. In this partnership to support a community head, the struggle for honor “is not only the basis upon which individuals compete but also that on which they cooperate. Here the notion of steadfastness is crucial, whether it binds together those who recognize their mutual equality or those whose relationship is one of patron and client.” (Pitt-Rivers 1968). Additionally, in this struggle for honour, “the reciprocal demonstrations of favor, which might be called mutual honoring, establish relationships of solidarity” (Pitt-Rivers 1968:§Honor and social status) between the superior and those attached to them.

One last note on honor and submission, and possibly the most significant,

> *“honor validates itself by an appeal to the facts, submitting always to the reality of power, whether military, political, social, or economic and whether it rests upon the consensus of a community, the favor of superiors, or the control of sanctions. For this reason courage is the sine qua non of honor, and cowardice is always its converse. […] Willingness to stand up to opposition is essential to the acquisition, as to the defense, of honor, regardless of the mode of action that is adopted.” (Pitt-Rivers 1968:§Honor as precedence)*

In all of the varied “ordered structures” of honour-shame cultures, and in their layered and complex cultural presentations, courage is the most central virtue. In a collective, the individuals still fight for honour outside of their shared identity, and this identity is a “repository of personal honor […] Therefore, the dishonor cast on one member is felt by all”

(Pitt-Rivers 1968:§Collective honor). In a collectivistic, honour-shame culture, to have been arranged into a shared identity is to be obligated to support, defend, honor, and respect everyone in the collective, not just the designated head. That hypotassō is regularly used of relationships which are also described as partnerships, brotherhoods, guardianships, and stewardship is a semantic association which should not be easily discarded.

5.2 Comparison to submission

Padgett presents "submission" as having two primary senses (definitions) for the modern reader,

> *"the first type (type I) comes from the realm of political and military struggle. This type of submission is obedience to an external authority, which can be voluntary but often is not. The second type of submission (type II) is one the comes from personal relationships and is often based on love or compassion […] and is a kind of gift or grace" (Padgett 2011:xiii)."*

Based on these types, he analyses Ephesians' and 1 Peter's presentation of submission, concluding that type II is clearly what Jesus "taught and demonstrated", asserting, "servant leadership is simply type II submission for those in leadership roles" (2011:55). Pitt-Rivers made a similar observation, that "honor and leadership imply one another" (1968: §Honor as precedence). It should be noted the Padgett idealizes "submission" as more than a state of mind, or internal alignment—to submit is a gift of servant leadership. This concept aligns with Pitt-River's idealization of courage—the necessary virtue of honour.

Now, I appreciate Padgett's argument, and I found many other commentators took a similar approach, albeit while obfuscating the semantics, by proposing "submission" or "subjection" as the best translations for hypotassō, with the caveat that one adopts a different concept of submission than is most common. Padgett notes that "submission is not a positive word in American culture or ethical thinking. This is particularly true among those who work for justice for the poor, the oppressed, and the marginalized" (Padgett 2011:37). When one looks in a dictionary, Padgett's type II interpretation is not what is found:

Table 5-1

Word	Senses [OED]
Submit	1. accept or yield to a superior force or to the authority or will of another person. *"the original settlers were forced to submit to Bulgarian rule";* agree to refer a matter to a

	third party for decision or adjudication. *"the United States refused to submit to arbitration"* 2. subject to a particular process, treatment, or condition.
Submission	1. the action of accepting or yielding to a superior force or to the will or authority of another person. *"they were forced into submission"* 2. the action of presenting a proposal, application, or other document for consideration or judgement. *"reports should be prepared for submission at partners' meetings"*
Submissive	ready to conform to the authority or will of others; meekly obedient or passive. *"a submissive, almost sheeplike people"*
Subject	1. cause or force someone or something to undergo (a particular experience or form of treatment, typically an unwelcome or unpleasant one*). "he'd subjected her to a terrifying ordeal"* 2. bring (a person or country) under one's control or jurisdiction, typically by using force. *"the city had been subjected to Macedonian rule"*
Subjection	the action of subjecting a country or person to one's control, or the fact of being subjected. *"the country's subjection to European colonialism"*

The "submit" terms[33] denote an entity's direct relationship to authority. There is a subtle difference with hypotassō, in that hypotassō denotes a *relationship between entities in a context of authority*, not necessarily the relationship to authority itself. This is most clearly seen in the adjective "submissive"—the expected response and demeanour of someone who has submitted is meek obedience and passivity; however, the expected response of someone placed into a relations via hypotassō is courageous, respectful, active engagement in a community's pursuit of honor—and even servant leadership within the community.

The modern individualistic understanding of the semantic field of submission and subjection is linguistically, through the prefix *sub-*, and rhetorically focussed on the placement of one's own authority, while the ancient understanding of hypotassō is the formation of bonds which create community. While hypotassō, in the right context and use, can denote the modern concept of submission or subjection, it generally does not. Hypotassō also does not explicitly promote subversion—though its use in Ephesians 5:21 infers that by respecting each other, the social strata of the day are flattened. The modern conception of "being a subject" see the king as sovereign, while hypotassō recognizes an external authority. Thus, the ostensible etymological association of "hypo-" and "sub-" is shown to be superficial at best. Through hypotassō one is not "put under another", so much as "two are joined as one" within a certain jurisdiction. This jurisdiction may be human or divine, it can be an individual or organization—that both in a reciprocal relationship answer to an external authority palliates the struggle for honour through "a provision that saves society from anarchy. Indeed, this

[33] Submit has one qualified application which refers to a third-party authority.

struggle is not only the basis upon which individuals compete but also that on which they cooperate." (Pitt-Rivers 1968: §Honor and social status).

5.3 Concluding remarks

In our present times, especially in individualistic societies, the language of patronage and honor has become archaic and even pejorative (Pitt-Rivers 1968); but to understand the testimony of the ancient sources requires careful investigation. The authors that penned the deutero-Pauline and catholic epistles did so from a variety of interrelated, complex social systems—and the distinction of fine shades of meaning is important. One cannot simply conflate the jurisdictional role of authority with the unifying force of love.

I was not exactly sure what I would find when I embarked on this research—on one hand, there was the potential to join the chorus of voices that find the NT hopelessly oppressive; on the other, the opportunity to discover a silver bullet, useful to slay the transmogrifying beast of oppression. I think I ended up somewhere in the middle. That hypotassō denotes the creation of unequal relationships, with implications of at least some privilege, preference, and precedence, is undeniable. However, in looking closer at the textual contexts of the term, its paradigmatic relationships, and the thought world associated by reference and allusion, there seems to be more to the word than submissiveness or subjection. Now, certainly, patronage was not all it was cracked up to be. Masters were abusive—and kings were arrogant. I cannot argue that obligation to an oppressive elite is liberation, nor am I trying to. I am arguing that in many modern translations and in much modern theologizing, the term hypotassō is understood anachronistically from behind and ahead. The term was not always and clearly a military term used to denote authoritarian leadership, nor is the term to be understood as the acquiescence of personal authority leading to submissiveness.

There are a few avenues I see moving forward. That the deutero-Pauline corpus uses hypotassō to incorporate a seemingly more developed theology and Christology into Hellenistic and natively Greek forms deserves more research. The authors' uses of hypotassō infer a repackaging of Jewish and early church thought into a more natively Greek idiom—a more faithful understanding of hypotassō might help clarify their teaching and even help date the texts. The catholic epistles use the term to promote the exemplary identity of a suffering servant and prescribe respectful endurance in the face of oppression as children of God; and I think more research should be conducted to evaluate the phenomena of honour and obligation as empowerment. A diachronic evaluation of how the term was used

by later authors and redactors would be helpful to isolate early parenetic from later church praxis; and in doing so help tease out more helpful universal truths. Finally, the terminology used to express hypotassō needs to be adjusted in the modern English hermeneutic and translation effort, as the continued use of pejorative and anachronistic terminology creates ambiguity leading to abuse, not a clarification on the nature of love and humility.

More simply put—no, I do not think submit is a good translation of hypotassō. While not a comment on the intentionality of the translators, the modern interpretative effort regarding hypotassō displays a certain anachronism and eisegesis. By subjecting “submission”, a term meant to bind people together in cooperation, respect, and, yes, even the tyranny of honor (Crook 2009:611); has been put into service of those who seek divide, demean, and aggrandize themselves over others.

Works Cited

Bibles, Translations, and Reference Sources [w/Abbr.]

[BDAG] Arndt, W., Danker, F.W., & Bauer, W. (2000). *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. 3rd edition*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

[EB1911] (1910). *The Encyclopaedia Britannica: A Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, Literature, and General Information. Eleventh edition.* Vols. i–xiv. Cambridge, UK: University Press.

[IGNTP] International Greek New Testament Project (2012). *Codex Sinaiticus: Septuagint and New Testament*. Cambridge, UK: The Codex Sinaiticus Project Board.

[LBD] (2016). *The Lexham Bible Dictionary*. Barry, J.D., Bomar, D., Brown, D.R., Klippenstein, R., Mangum, D., Sinclair Wolcott, C., Widder, W. (eds.). Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press.

[LES] (2012). *The Lexham English Septuagint.* Brannan, R., Penner, K.M., Loken, I., Aubrey, M., & Hoogendyk, I. (eds.). Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press.

[LIS] (2012). *The Lexham Greek-English Interlinear Septuagint. H.B. Swete Edition*. Tan, R.K., deSilva, D.A., & Hoogendyk, I. (eds.). Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press.

[LALS] (2012). *The Lexham Analytical Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press.

[LN/Louw-Nida] Louw, J.P., & Nida, E.A. (1996). *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains. Electronic ed. of the 2nd edition*. New York, NY: United Bible Societies.

[LSJ] Liddell, Scott, & Jones (1940). *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Revised and augmented throughout by. Sir H.S. Jones. with the assistance of R. McKenzie. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press. Accessed online from http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/, [2020-04-16].

[UBS5/AGNT] Friberg, T., & Friberg, B. (2019). *Analytical Greek New Testament Plus. UBS5 Edition*. Dallas, TX: SIL International.

[UBS5*] (2014). *The Greek New Testament: Apparatus. Fifth Revised Edition*. Aland, B., Aland, K., Karavidopoulos, J., Martini, C.M., & Metzger, B. (eds.). Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft; American Bible Society; United Bible Societies.

[TDNT] Bromiley, G.W. (1985). *The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament: Abridged in One Volume*. Kittel, G., & Friedrich, G. (eds.). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

[NASL] [2020] *NAS New Testament Greek Lexicon*. Online resource. Accessed from https://www.biblestudytools.com/lexicons/greek/nas/, [2020-04-16].

[OED] Oxford English Dictionary (2019). *Lexico.com. Online dictionary*. Oxford University Press (OUP). Accessed from https://lexico.com/definitions, [2020-05-26].

[NASB] (1999). *Classic Reference Bible: Updated New American Standard Bible*. Grand Rapids, MI: The Zondervan Corporation.

[RSVCE] (1971). *Revised Standard Version of the Bible)*. National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America.

[OB] OpenBible (2001). *Cross References*. Online resource. Accessed from https://www.openbible.info/labs/cross-references, [2020-05-07].

Articles, Books, and Online Sources

Achtemeier, P. (1996). 1 Peter: A Commentary on First Peter. In E. Epp (ed.), *Hermeneia: A Critical & Historical Commentary on the Bible*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress.

Adams, S.L. 2008. Ezekiel 34:11–19. *Interpretation (Richmond)* 62(3):304–306.

Alexander, R.H. (2010). Ezekiel. In T. Longman III & D. E. Garland (eds.), *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Jeremiah–Ezekiel. Revised Edition (Vol. 7)*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Allison, D.C. (2013). *James: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*. London, UK: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.

Arichea, D.C.& Nida, E.A.(1980). *A Handbook on the First Letter from Peter*. New York, NY: United Bible Societies.

Angel, H. (2013). Sarah's Treatment of Hagar (Genesis 16): Morals, Messages, and Mesopotamia. *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 41(4):211-218.

Arnold, C.E. (2010). Ephesians. In *Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Babbitt, F.C. (1928). *Plutarch Moralia with an English Translation*. Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press. London. William Heinemann Ltd. Accessed from https://perseus.tufts.edu/, [25-11-2020].

Bartsch, H.W. (1968). Foundation and Meaning of Christian pacifism. *Brethren Life and Thought* 13(1):20-29.

Bauman-Martin, B.J. (2004). Women on the Edge: New Perspectives on Women in the Petrine Haustafel*. Journal of Biblical Literature* 123(2):253-279.

Bedale, S. (1954). The Meaning of Kephale in the Pauline Epistles*. Journal of Theological Studies* (October):211-215.

Bernardakis, G.N. (1888). *Plutarch Moralia*. Leipzig. Teubner. 1888. Accessed on https://perseus.tufts.edu/, [25-11-2020].

Best, E. (1998). A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians. In *International Critical Commentary*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark International.

Bowden, A. (2015). Translating Ἀσθενέω in James 5 in Light of the Prophetic LXX. *The Bible Translator* 66(1):91–105.

Bratcher, R.G., & Nida, E.A. (1993). *A handbook on Paul's letters to the Colossians and to Philemon*. New York, NY: United Bible Societies.

Bruce, F.F. (1984). The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians. In *New International Commentary on the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Bryant, K.E. (2016*). Paul and the Rise of the Slave*. Leiden, NE: Brill.

Buszard, B. (2010). The Speech of Greek and Roman Women in Plutarch's Lives. *Classical Philology* 105(1):83-115.

Carr, D.M. (2010). *An Introduction to the Old Testament: Sacred Texts and Imperial Contexts of the Hebrew Bible*. West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Carson, D.A. & Moo, D.J. (2005). *An Introduction to the New Testament. 2nd Edition.* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Catlin, M. (2020). God opposes the Proud: James Cone, White Theologians, and Proverbs 3:34. *Review & Expositor* 117(1):72–84

Cervin, R. (2006). Paul in Context. *Priscilla Papers*, Spring 2016. Online article, accessed from https://cbeinternational.org, [2020-07-06].

Charles, D.J. (2006). 1 Peter. In Longman, T. III & Garland, E. (eds.), *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. *Hebrews–Revelation Revised Edition (Vol. 13)*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Christoyannopoulos, A. (2011). *Christian Anarchism: A Political Commentary on the Gospel*. Exeter, UK: Andrews UK.

Cook, J. (2020). The Septuagint of Proverbs as a Jewish Document. In Cook, J., & Rosel, M. (eds.), *Towards a Theology of the Septuagint: Stellenbosch Congress on the Septuagint*. Atlanta, GA: SB.L. Press.

Crook, Z. (2009). Honor, Shame, and Social Status Revisited. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 128(3):591-611.

Daube, D. (1947). Participle and Imperative in 1 Peter. In *The First Epistle of St. Peter: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Essays, by E. G. Selwyn. 2nd ed.* London, UK: Macmillan.

Davids, P.H. (1982). *The Epistle of James: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Dakyns, H.G. (1998). *Xenophon, Hipparchikos (The Calvary General)*. Translated by H.G. Dakyns. Project Gutenberg Ebooks.

deSilva, D.A. (2004). Re-writing "Household" in the Early Church. *Ashland Theological Journal* 36(0):85-94.

_____ (2004*). An Introduction to the New Testament: Contexts, Methods and Ministry Formation*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

_____ (2008). *Despising Shame: Honor Discourse and Community Maintenance in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Revised edition*. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature.

Dickson, J., & Rosner, B. (2004). Humility as a Social Virtue in the Hebrew Bible? *Vetus Testamentum* 54(4):459-479.

Dindorf, W. (1853). *Harpocrationis Lexicon in Decem Oratores Atticos* (vol. 1). (repr. Groningen: Bouma, 1969). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Dinkler, M.B. (2007). Sarah's Submission: Peter's Analogy in 1 Peter 3:5–6. *Priscilla Papers* 21(3):9-15.

Dover, K.J. (1974). *Greek Popular Morality: In the time of Plato and Aristotle* (reprinted with corrections by Hackett Publishing 1994). Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.

Dudrey, R. (1999). Submit Yourselves to One Another: A socio-historical look at the household code of Ephesians 5:15-6:9*. Restoration Quarterly* 41:27-44.

Elliot, J.H. (1995). Disgraced Yet Graced. The Gospel according to 1 Peter in the Key of Honor and Shame. *Biblical Theology Bulletin, A Journal of Bible and Theology* 25(4):166-178.

_____ (2007). *Conflict, Community, and Honor: 1 Peter in Social-Scientific Perspective. Cascade Companions*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers.

Eng, D. (2019).The Widening Circle: Honour, Shame, and Collectivism in the Parable of Prodigal Son. *Expository Times* 130(5):193-201.

Fee, G.D. (1985). Reflections on church order in the pastoral epistles, with further reflection on the hermeneutics of ad hoc documents. *Jets* 28(2):141-151.

_____ (1999). Gender Issues: Reflections on the Perspective of the Apostle Paul. *Crux* XXXV(2):34-45.

_____ (2002). The Cultural Context Of Ephesians 5:18-6:9*. Priscilla Papers* 16(1):3-8.

Feinburg, P. (1999). The Christian and Civil Authorities. *The Masters Seminary Journal* 10(1):97-99.

Fitzmyer, J.A. (1988). Revue de Qumrân, Memorial Jen Carmignac (Vol. 13), *No. 1/4* (49/52):609-620.

Goldsworthy, G. (2000). *Gospel & Kingdom. The Goldsworthy Trilogy*. Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster.

Goodspeed, E.J. (1901). The Acts of Paul and Thecla. *The Biblical World* 17(3):185-190.

Goppelt, L. (1993*). A Commentary on 1 Peter*. Translated by J.E. Alsup. Grand Rapids, MI, UDS: Eerdmans.

Graham, G. (2008). *An Exegetical Summary of Ephesians*. *2nd edition*. Dallas, TX: SIL International.

Green, J.B. (2007). 1 Peter. In *Two Horizons New Testament Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Grudem, W.A. (2004). *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine*. Leicester, England; Grand Rapids, MI: Inter-Varsity Press; Zondervan Pub. House.

Hamilton, V.P. (1990). The Book of Genesis, Chapters 1–17. In *New International Commentary of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Hansen, W.F. (1998). *Anthology of Ancient Greek Popular Literature*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Hanson, A.T. (1968). *Studies in the Pastoral Epistles*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock.

Hengel, M., & Markschies, C. (1989). *The 'hellenization' of Judaea in the First Century after Christ*. London: SCM Press.

Hoekema, D.A. (1986). A Practical Christian Pacifism. *The Christian Century* 103(31):917-919.

Hubbard, D.A., Barker G.W., Watts J.D.W, & Martin, R.P. (1987). Editorial Preface. In *Genesis 1–15 (Vol. 1)*. Dallas: Word, Incorporated.

Ibach, T., & Blight, R.C. (2003). *Exegetical Helps on Titus*. J. Beekman (ed). Mexico: SIL International.

Jobes, K.H. (2005). 1 Peter. In *Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

_____ (2009). The Minor Prophets in James, 1 & 2 Peter and Jude. In Menken, M.J.J., & Moyise, S. (eds.), *The Minor Prophets in the New Testament*. *Library of New Testament Studies* 377:135-153. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Joosten, J. (2016). The Relation of the Septuagint of Proverbs to the Septuagint of Psalms. In Gauthier, R.X., Kotzé, G.R., & Steyn, G. (eds.),*Septuagint, Sages, and Scripture. Studies in Honour of Johann Cook.* VTS 172. Leiden: Brill.

Kanavou, N. (2006). Personal Names in the Vita Aesopi (Vita, G. or Perriana). *The Classical Quarterly, New Series* 56(1):208-219.

Kaye, N. (2018). Taxation in the Greco-Roman World: The Hellenistic East. *Oxford Handbooks Online*. Oxford University Press. Accessed online at oxfordhandbooks.com, [25-11-2020].

Keener, C.S. (1992). *Paul, Women & Wives: Marriage and Women's Ministry in the Letters of Paul.* Peabody MA: Hendrickson Publishers Inc.

Kenyon, F.G. (1920). *Constitution of the Athenians*. In Oxford Classical Texts. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Klawans, J. (2016). The Essene Hypothesis: Insights from Religion 101. *Dead Sea Discoveries* 23(1), pp51-78.

Klein, W.W. (2006). Ephesians. In T. Longman III, & D. E. Garland (eds.), *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Ephesians–Philemon. Revised Edition (Vol. 12)*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Knight, G.W. (1992). *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans; Carlisle, England: Paternoster Press.

Koehler, L., Baumgartner, W., Richardson, M.E.J., & Stamm, J.J. (2000). *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament. Electronic edition*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Konstantakos, I.M. (2013). A Review-Article on Manolis Papathomopoulos' Recent Edition of the Vita Aesopi, Version, G. *Myrtia* (28):355-392.

Kostenberger, A. (2016). A Complex Sentence: The Syntax of 1 Timothy 2:12. In A. Kostenberger, & T. Schreiner (eds.). *Women in the Church. 3rd edition*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway.

Kroeger, C., & Nason-Clark, N. (2010). *No place for abuse: Biblical and practical resources to counteract domestic violence. 2nd edition*. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press.

Kurke, L. (2006). Plato, Aesop, and the Beginnings of Mimetic Prose. *Representations* 94(1):6-52

_____ (2010). *Aesopic Conversations: Popular Tradition, Cultural Dialogue, and the Invention of Greek Prose. Course Book edition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Laansma, J.C. (2009). Commentary on 2 Timothy. In *Cornerstone Biblical Commentary: 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus, and Hebrews (Vol. 17)*. Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House Publishers.

Lappenga, B. (2017). James 3:13-4:10 and the Language of Envy in Proverbs 3. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 136(4):989+.

Llewelyn, S.R. (1992). *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity, Volume 8*. NSW, Australia: Macuquarie University.

Lincoln, A.T. (1990). Ephesians. In *Word Biblical Commentary* 42. Dallas, TX: Word, Incorporated.

Lockett, D.R. (2015). Are the Catholic Epistles a Canonically Significant Collection? A Status Quaestionis. *Currents in Biblical Research* 14(1):62–80.

Logan, J. (2018). Marriage Made in Heaven? The contemporary reception of Ephesians 5:21-33 among women. Durham theses, Durham University.

Lohse, E. (1986). Parenesis and Kerygma in 1 Peter (trans. John Steeley). In C.H. Talbert (ed.), *Perspectives on First Peter*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.

Longenecker, R. N (2016). *The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. I.H. Marshall & D.A. Hagner (eds.). Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Louw, J.P. (1982). *The Semantics of New Testament Greek*. Atlanta, GA: Scholar's Press.

Lovik, E.G. (1995). A Look at the Ancient House Codes and Their Contributions to Understanding 1 Peter 3:1-7. *Calvary Baptist Theological Journal* 11:49-63.

Lu S-M (2016). Woman's Role in New Testament Household Codes: Transforming First-Century Roman Culture. *Priscilla Papers* 30(1):9-15.

Macaskill, G. (2018). Christian Scriptures and the Formation of Intellectual Humility*. Journal of psychology and theology* 46(4):243–252.

MacDonald, M.Y. (2008). Colossians and Ephesians. In Daniel, & J. Harrington (eds.), *Sacra Pagina*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press.

_____ (2012). Reading the New Testament Household Codes in Light of New Research on Children and Childhood in the Roman World. *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 41(3):376–387.

Marshall, I.H. (2004). Mutual Love and Submission in Marriage: Colossians 3:18-19 and Ephesians 5:21-33. In Pierce, R.W., Groothuis, R.M., & Fee, G.D. (eds.), *Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementarity Without Hierarchy*. Downers Grove, Il: InterVarsity Press.

Marshall, I.H., & Towner, P.H. (2004*). A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*. London; New York: T&T Clark International.

Martin, R.P. (1988). James. In *Word Biblical Commentary* 48. Dallas, TX: Word, Incorporated.

Mays, J.L. (2006). *Preaching and Teaching the Psalms.* Miller, P.D., & Tucker, G.M. (eds.). Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.

McKay, K.L. (1985). Aspect in imperatival constructions in new testament Greek. *Novum Testamentum* 27(3):201-226.

McKnight, S. (2011). The Letter of James. *In New International Commentary on the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI; Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Meade, D.G. (1986). *Pseudonymity and Canon*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Mein, A. (2007). Profitable and Unprofitable Shepherds: Economic and Theological Perspectives on Ezekiel 34. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 31(4):493-504.

Michaels, J.R. (1988). 1 Peter. In *Word Biblical Commentary* 49. Dallas, TX: Word, Incorporated.

Miller, G. (1993). Contracts of Genesis. *The Journal of Legal Studies* 22(1):15-45.

Mngqibisa, O.T. (2006). The Relationship of Humankind and Nature According to Psalm 8. *Stellenbosch University Doctoral Degrees (Old and New Testament)* [75].

Moo, D.J. (2018). The Letter to the Romans. In N. B. Stonehouse, F. F. Bruce, G. D. Fee, & J. B. Green (eds.), *New International Commentary of the New Testament*. *Second Edition*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Mounce, W.D. (2000). Pastoral Epistles. In *Word Biblical Commentary* 46. Dallas, TX: Word, Incorporated.

Mouton, E. (2015). Faithful Discipleship and Responsible Citizenship? Reimagining Household Ethos in View of Ephesians 5:21-33. *Neotestamentica* 48(1):163-185.

NACR (National Associate for Christian Recovery) [2020]. *Obedience and Submission*. Online Resource. Accessed from https://www.nacr.org, [2020-05-28].

Ng, E.Y.L. (2004). Acts of Paul and Thecla. Women's stories and precedent?. *The Journal of Theological Studies, New Series* 55(1):1-29.

Nida, E.A., & Louw, J.P. (1992). *Lexical Semantics of the Greek New Testament*. In D.E. Aune (ed.), Vol. 25. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

Niehoff, M.R. (2004). Mother and Maiden, Sister and Spouse: Sarah in Philonic Midrash. *Harvard Theological Review* 97(4):413-44.

Nikolaidis, A. (1997). Plutarch on Women and Marriage. *Wiener Studien* 110:27-88.

Nyland, A. (2003). Papryi, Women, and Word Meaning in the New Testament. *Priscilla Papers* 17(4). Accessed online at https://www.cbeinternational.org/, [15-10-2020].

O'Brien, P.T. (1982). Colossians, Philemon. In *Word Biblical Commentary*. Dallas, TX: Word, Incorporated.

Olree, A. (2005). Government as God's Agent: A Reconsideration of Romans 12 and 13. *Stone-Campbell Journal* 8:181-197.

Osborne, G.R. (2011). 1 Peter. In P.W. Comfort (ed.), *Cornerstone Biblical Commentary: James, 1–2 Peter, Jude, Revelation*. Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House Publishers.

_____ (2011). James. In P.W. Comfort (ed*.). Cornerstone Biblical Commentary: James, 1–2 Peter, Jude, Revelation*. Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House Publishers.

Osiek, C. (1996). The Family in Early Christianity: "Family Values" Revisited. *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 58(1):1-24.

_____ (2002). The Bride of Christ (Ephesians 5:22-33): A Problematic Wedding. *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 32(1):29–39.

Padgett, A.G. (2011). *As Christ Submits to the Church*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

Pao, D.W. (2012). Colossians and Philemon. In *Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Perry, B.E. (1952). *Aesopica, Vol. 1*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Peterman, G. (1999). Marriage and Sexual Fidelity in the Papyri, Plutarch, and Paul. *Tyndale Bulletin* 50.

Pitt-Rivers, J. (1968). Honor*. International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* 6:503-511.

Pitts, A. (2016). Martin Hengel, the New Tübingen School,and the Study of Christian Origin. In Porter, S.E., & S.A. Adams (eds.), *Pillars in the History of Biblical Interpretation, Volume 2: Prevailing Methods after 1980. McMaster Biblical Studies Series*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications.

Polemis, J. [2020]. *Philological Remarks in Vita G of Aesop*. University of Athens.

Porter, S.E. (2013). *How We Got the New Testament: Text, Transmission, Translation.* L.M. McDonald, & C.A. Evans (eds.). Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

Preato, D. (2009). A Fresh Perspective on Submission and Authority in Marriage. *Priscilla Papers* 19(1):20-25.

Punt, J. (2007). Subverting Sarah in the New Testament: Galatians 4 and 1 Peter 3. *Scriptura* 96:453-468

_____ (2013). Framing human dignity through domination and submission? Negotiating borders and loyalties (of power) in the New Testament. *Scriptura* 112(1):1-17.

Regev, E. (2018). Community as Temple: Revisiting Cultic Metaphors in Qumran and the New Testament. *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 28(4):604–631.

Resane, K.T. (2014). Leadership for the church: The shepherd model. *HTS Theological Studies* 70(1):1-6.

Retief, C.W. (2014). A Messianic Reading of Psalm 8. *Old Testament Essays* 27(3):992–1008.

Rupprecht, H.A. (1998). Marriage Contract Regulations and Documentary Practice in the Greek Papyri. *Scripta Classica Israelica* 17:60-76.

Rylaarsdam, J.C. & Davis, H.G. (2018). Biblical literature. In *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Online Resource, accessed at https://www.britannica.com/topic/biblical-literature.

Sailhamer, J.H. (2008). Genesis. In T. Longman III, & D.E. Garland (eds.), *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Genesis–Leviticus. Revised Edition (Vol. 1)*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Schöpflin, K. (2013). I Shall Feed Them with Good Pasture« (Ezek 34:14). The Shepard Motif in Ezekiel 34: Its Theological Import and Socio-political Implications. *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche wissenschaft* 125(2):365.

Schreiner, T.R. (2005). "Women in Ministry: Another Complementarian Perspective". In J.R. Beck (ed.), *Two Views on Women in Ministry. Revised edition*. *Counterpoints*. Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan.

Sly, D.I. (1991). 1 Peter 3:6b in the Light of Philo and Josephus. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 110(1):126-9.

Spicq, C. & Ernest, J.D. (1994). *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament (vol. 3)*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson

Stadter, P.A. (2014). *Plutarch & His Roman Readers*. Oxford, UK:Oxford University Press.

Stanley, D.M. (1957). The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism: An Essay in Biblical Theology. *Theological Studies* 18(2):169-215.

Stuckenbruck, L.T. (2014). Traveling Ethics: The Case of the Household Codes in Ephesians 5:21-6:9 in Cross-Cultural Perspective. In Krech, V., & Steinicke, M. (eds.), *Dynamics in the History of Religions Volume 5.* Leiden: Brill.

Tervanotko, H. & Uusimäki, E. (2018). Sarah the Princess: Tracing the Hellenistic Afterlife of a Pentateuchal Female Figure. *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 32(2):115-134.

Thompson, D.L. (2010). Ezekiel. In P. W. Comfort (ed.*), Cornerstone Biblical Commentary: Ezekiel & Daniel (Vol. 9)*. Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House Publishers.

Towner, P. (1989). *The Goal of our Instruction*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press.

Travis, E.J. (1974). *Exegetical Helps on the Epistle to the Ephesians*. J. Beekman (ed.). Dallas: SIL International.

Volt, I. (2003). Aspects of Ancient Greek Moral Vocabulary. *Trames* 7 (57/52):67–82.

Wallace, D.B. (1996). *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

_____ (2000). *The Basics of New Testament Syntax: An Intermediate Greek Grammar*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Walton, J.H. (2009). *Zondervan Illustrated Bible Backgrounds Commentary (Old Testament): Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel (Vol. 4)*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Wenham, G.J. (1994). Genesis 16–50. In *Word Biblical Commentary* 2. Dallas, TX: Word, Incorporated.

Westenberg, L. (2017). 'When She Calls for Help'—Domestic Violence in Christian Families. *Social Sciences* 6(3):71.

Westfall, C.L. (2016). *Paul and Gender: Reclaiming the Apostle's Vision for Men and Women in Christ.* Grand Rapids MI: Baker Academic.

Wieland, G.M. (2009). Roman Crete and the letter to Titus. *New Testament Studies* 55:338-354. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, T.B. (2011). Reconsidering the Imperatival Participle in 1 Peter. *Westminster Theological Journal* 73:59-78

Wink, W. (1987). *Violence and Nonviolence in South Africa: Jesus' Third Way*. Philadelphia, PA: New Society Publishers.

Wolters, A. (2011). Head as Metaphor in Paul. *Koers* 76(1):137-153.

Wordelman, A.L. (1998). Everyday Life: Women in the Period of the New Testament. In C.A. Newsom & S.H. Ringe (eds), *The Women's Bible Commentary* (London: SPCK):390-396.

Zamfir, K. (2018). Returning Women to their Place? Religious fundamentalism, gender bias, and violence against women. *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies* 17(51):3-20.

Appendix 1: Rendering in major English translations

The following tables list all deutero-Pauline and catholic epistolary contexts of hypotassō in such a manner as to evaluate the consistent rendering of “submission” or “subjection”.

Ref	Eph 1:22	Eph 5:21	Eph 5:24	Col 3:18
NIV	And God placed all things under his feet and appointed him to be head over everything for the church,	Submit to one another out of reverence for Christ.	Now as the church submits to Christ, so also wives should submit to their husbands in everything.	Wives, submit yourselves to your husbands, as is fitting in the Lord.
NET	And God put all things under Christ’s feet, and he gave him to the church as head over all things.	and submitting to one another out of reverence for Christ.	But as the church submits to Christ, so also wives should submit to their husbands in everything.	Wives, submit to your husbands, as is fitting in the Lord.
KJV	And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church,	Submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God.	Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing.	Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as it is fit in the Lord.
CEV	God has put all things under the power of Christ, and for the good of the church he has made him the head of everything.	Honor Christ and put others first.	Wives should always put their husbands first, as the church puts Christ first.	A wife must put her husband first. This is her duty as a follower of the Lord.
GNT	God put all things under Christ’s feet and gave him to the church as supreme Lord over all things.	Submit yourselves to one another because of your reverence for Christ.	And so wives must submit completely to their husbands just as the church submits itself to Christ.	Wives, submit to your husbands, for that is what you should do as Christians.
NRSV	And he has put all things under his feet and has made him the head over all things for the church,	Be subject to one another out of reverence for Christ.	Just as the church is subject to Christ, so also wives ought to be, in everything, to their husbands.	Wives, be subject to your husbands, as is fitting in the Lord.
NASB	And He put all things in subjection under His feet, and gave Him as head over all things to the church,	and be subject to one another in the fear of Christ.	But as the church is subject to Christ, so also the wives ought to be to their husbands in everything.	Wives, be subject to your husbands, as is fitting in the Lord.
ESV	And he put all things under his feet and gave him as head over all things to the church,	submitting to one another out of reverence for Christ.	Now as the church submits to Christ, so also wives should submit in everything to their husbands.	Wives, submit to your husbands, as is fitting in the Lord.
NLT	God has put all things under the authority of Christ and has made him head over all things for the benefit of the church.	And further, submit to one another out of reverence for Christ.	As the church submits to Christ, so you wives should submit to your husbands in everything.	Wives, submit to your husbands, as is fitting for those who belong to the Lord.

Ref	Titus 2:5	Titus 2:9	Titus 3:1
NIV	to be self-controlled and pure, to be busy at home, to be kind, and to be subject to their husbands, so that no one will malign the word of God.	Teach slaves to be subject to their masters in everything, to try to please them, not to talk back to them,	Remind the people to be subject to rulers and authorities, to be obedient, to be ready to do whatever is good,
NET	to be self-controlled, pure, fulfilling their duties at home, kind, being subject to their own husbands, so that the message of God may not be discredited.	Slaves are to be subject to their own masters in everything, to do what is wanted and not talk back,	Remind them to be subject to rulers and authorities, to be obedient, to be ready for every good work.

KJV	To be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed.	Exhort servants to be obedient unto their own masters, and to please them well in all things; not answering again;	Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work,
CEV	Each of the younger women must be sensible and kind, as well as a good homemaker, who puts her own husband first. Then no one can say insulting things about God's message.	Tell slaves always to please their owners by obeying them in everything. Slaves must not talk back to their owners	Remind your people to obey the rulers and authorities and not to be rebellious. They must always be ready to do something helpful
GNT	to be self-controlled and pure, and to be good housewives who submit to their husbands, so that no one will speak evil of the message that comes from God.	Slaves are to submit to their masters and please them in all things. They must not answer them back	Remind your people to submit to rulers and authorities, to obey them, and to be ready to do good in every way.
NRSV	to be self-controlled, chaste, good managers of the household, kind, being submissive to their husbands, so that the word of God may not be discredited.	Tell slaves to be submissive to their masters and to give satisfaction in every respect; they are not to talk back,	Remind them to be subject to rulers and authorities, to be obedient, to be ready for every good work,
NASB	to be sensible, pure, workers at home, kind, being subject to their own husbands, so that the word of God will not be dishonored.	Urge bondslaves to be subject to their own masters in everything, to be well-pleasing, not argumentative,	Remind them to be subject to rulers, to authorities, to be obedient, to be ready for every good deed,
ESV	to be self-controlled, pure, working at home, kind, and submissive to their own husbands, that the word of God may not be reviled.	Bondservants are to be submissive to their own masters in everything; they are to be well-pleasing, not argumentative,	Remind them to be submissive to rulers and authorities, to be obedient, to be ready for every good work,
NLT	to live wisely and be pure, to work in their homes, to do good, and to be submissive to their husbands. Then they will not bring shame on the word of God.	Slaves must always obey their masters and do their best to please them. They must not talk back	Remind the believers to submit to the government and its officers. They should be obedient, always ready to do what is good.

Ref	James 4:7	1 Pet 2:13	1 Pet 3:22	1 Pet 2:18
NIV	Submit yourselves, then, to God. Resist the devil, and he will flee from you.	Submit yourselves for the Lord's sake to every human authority: whether to the emperor, as the supreme authority,	who has gone into heaven and is at God's right hand—with angels, authorities and powers in submission to him.	Slaves, in reverent fear of God submit yourselves to your masters, not only to those who are good and considerate, but also to those who are harsh.
NET	So submit to God. But resist the devil and he will flee from you.	Be subject to every human institution for the Lord's sake, whether to a king as supreme	who went into heaven and is at the right hand of God with angels and authorities and powers subject to him.	Slaves, be subject to your masters with all reverence, not only to those who are good and gentle, but also to those who are perverse.
KJV	Submit yourselves therefore to God. Resist the devil, and he will flee from you.	Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme;	Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him.	Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward.
CEV	Surrender to God! Resist the devil, and he will run from you.	The Lord wants you to obey all human authorities, especially the Emperor, who rules over everyone.	Christ is now in heaven, where he sits at the right side of God. All angels, authorities, and powers are under his control.	Servants, you must obey your masters and always show respect to them. Do this, not only to those who are kind and thoughtful, but also to those who are cruel.
GNT	So then, submit to God. Resist the Devil, and he will	For the sake of the Lord submit to every human authority: to the	who has gone to heaven and is at the right-hand side of God, ruling over all angels	You servants must submit to your masters and show them complete respect, not only to those who are

	run away from you.	Emperor, who is the supreme authority,	and heavenly authorities and powers.	kind and considerate, but also to those who are harsh.
NRSV	Submit yourselves therefore to God. Resist the devil, and he will flee from you.	For the Lord's sake accept the authority of every human institution, whether of the emperor as supreme,	who has gone into heaven and is at the right hand of God, with angels, authorities, and powers made subject to him.	Slaves, accept the authority of your masters with all deference, not only those who are kind and gentle but also those who are harsh.
NASB	Submit therefore to God. Resist the devil and he will flee from you.	Submit yourselves for the Lord's sake to every human institution, whether to a king as the one in authority,	who is at the right hand of God, having gone into heaven, after angels and authorities and powers had been subjected to Him.	Servants, be submissive to your masters with all respect, not only to those who are good and gentle, but also to those who are unreasonable.
ESV	Submit yourselves therefore to God. Resist the devil, and he will flee from you.	Be subject for the Lord's sake to every human institution, whether it be to the emperor as supreme,	who has gone into heaven and is at the right hand of God, with angels, authorities, and powers having been subjected to him.	Servants, be subject to your masters with all respect, not only to the good and gentle but also to the unjust.
NLT	So humble yourselves before God. Resist the devil, and he will flee from you.	For the Lord's sake, submit to all human authority—whether the king as head of state,	Now Christ has gone to heaven. He is seated in the place of honor next to God, and all the angels and authorities and powers accept his authority.	You who are slaves must submit to your masters with all respect. Do what they tell you—not only if they are kind and reasonable, but even if they are cruel.

Ref	1 Pet 3:1	1 Pet 3:5	1 Pet 5:5
NIV	Wives, in the same way submit yourselves to your own husbands so that, if any of them do not believe the word, they may be won over without words by the behavior of their wives,	For this is the way the holy women of the past who put their hope in God used to adorn themselves. They submitted themselves to their own husbands,	In the same way, you who are younger, submit yourselves to your elders. All of you, clothe yourselves with humility toward one another, because, "God opposes the proud but shows favor to the humble."
NET	In the same way, wives, be subject to your own husbands. Then, even if some are disobedient to the word, they will be won over without a word by the way you live,	For in the same way the holy women who hoped in God long ago adorned themselves by being subject to their husbands,	In the same way, you who are younger, be subject to the elders. And all of you, clothe yourselves with humility toward one another, because God opposes the proud but gives grace to the humble.
KJV	Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, if any obey not the word, they also may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives;	For after this manner in the old time the holy women also, who trusted in God, adorned themselves, being in subjection unto their own husbands:	Likewise, ye younger, submit yourselves unto the elder. Yea, all of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility: for God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace to the humble.
CEV	If you are a wife, you must put your husband first. Even if he opposes our message, you will win him over by what you do. No one else will have to say anything to him,	Long ago those women who worshiped God and put their hope in him made themselves beautiful by putting their husbands first.	All of you young people should obey your elders. In fact, everyone should be humble toward everyone else. The Scriptures say, "God opposes proud people, but he helps everyone who is humble."
GNT	In the same way you wives must submit to your husbands, so that if any of them do not believe God's word, your conduct will win them over to believe. It will not be necessary for you to say a word,	For the devout women of the past who placed their hope in God used to make themselves beautiful by submitting to their husbands.	In the same way you younger people must submit to your elders. And all of you must put on the apron of humility, to serve one another; for the scripture says, "God resists the proud, but shows favour to the humble."

NRSV	Wives, in the same way, accept the authority of your husbands, so that, even if some of them do not obey the word, they may be won over without a word by their wives' conduct,	It was in this way long ago that the holy women who hoped in God used to adorn themselves by accepting the authority of their husbands.	In the same way, you who are younger must accept the authority of the elders. And all of you must clothe yourselves with humility in your dealings with one another, for "God opposes the proud, but gives grace to the humble."
NASB	In the same way, you wives, be submissive to your own husbands so that even if any of them are disobedient to the word, they may be won without a word by the behavior of their wives,	For in this way in former times the holy women also, who hoped in God, used to adorn themselves, being submissive to their own husbands;	You younger men, likewise, be subject to your elders; and all of you, clothe yourselves with humility toward one another, for GOD IS OPPOSED TO THE PROUD, BUT GIVES GRACE TO THE HUMBLE.
ESV	Likewise, wives, be subject to your own husbands, so that even if some do not obey the word, they may be won without a word by the conduct of their wives,	For this is how the holy women who hoped in God used to adorn themselves, by submitting to their own husbands,	Likewise, you who are younger, be subject to the elders. Clothe yourselves, all of you, with humility toward one another, for "God opposes the proud but gives grace to the humble."
NLT	In the same way, you wives must accept the authority of your husbands. Then, even if some refuse to obey the Good News, your godly lives will speak to them without any words. They will be won over	This is how the holy women of old made themselves beautiful. They put their trust in God and accepted the authority of their husbands.	In the same way, you who are younger must accept the authority of the elders. And all of you, dress yourselves in humility as you relate to one another, for "God opposes the proud but gives grace to the humble."

Appendix II: Phylarch in *The Duties of a Hipparch*

Excerpt from *The Project Gutenberg EBook of The Cavalry General, by Xenophon*. Translated by H.G. Dakyns. 2008.

"Your first duty is to offer sacrifice, petitioning the gods to grant you such good gifts as shall enable you in thought, word, and deed to discharge your office in the manner most acceptable to Heaven, and with fullest increase to yourself, and friends, and to the state at large of affection, glory, and wide usefulness. The goodwill of Heaven so obtained, you shall proceed to mount your troopers, taking care that the full complement which the law demands is reached, and that the normal force of cavalry is not diminished. […] But now suppose the complement of cavalry is levied, the duty will devolve on you of seeing, in the first place, that your horses are well fed and in condition to stand their work[…]; and in the second place, you will have to see to it the animals are tractable […] And now, supposing that your horses are all that they ought to be, like pains must be applied to train the men themselves. […] The general of cavalry, as patron of the whole department, is naturally responsible for its efficient working. In view, however, of the task imposed upon that officer had he to carry out these various details single-handed, the state has chosen to associate with him certain coadjutors in the persons of the phylarchs (or tribal captains), and has besides imposed upon the senate a share in the superintendence of the cavalry. This being so, two things appear to me desirable; the first is, so to work upon the phylarch that he shall share your own enthusiasm for the honour of the corps; and secondly, to have at your disposal in the senate able orators, whose language may instil a wholesome fear into the knights themselves, and thereby make them all the better men, or tend to pacify the senate on occasion and disarm unseasonable anger […] issue an order to your phylarchs that it will be their duty to put themselves at the head of the marksmen of several tribes, and to ride out to the butts for practice. In this way a spirit of emulation will be roused […] to ensure that splendour of accoutrement which the force requires, the greatest help may once again be looked for from the phylarchs; let these officers but be persuaded that from the public point of view the splendid appearance of their squadrons will confer a title to distinction far higher than that of any personal equipment […] to hold the office of phylarch itself proclaims a soul alive to honour and ambition […] But if you would rouse the emulation of your phylarchs, if you would stir in each a personal ambition to appear at the head of his own squadron in all ways splendidly appointed, the best incentive will be your personal example […] appoint, with the concurrence of the several phylarchs, certain decadarchs (file-leaders) to be selected […] "